

THE EISENHOWER LIBRARY



3 1151 02676 8527





On the  
Significance  
of the  
Sens ex Machina  
in the  
Extant Dramas  
of  
Euripides.

By  
Herbert B. Foster

Style should be made appropriate

more so than in





# Contents.

pp.

- I. Opinions of Modern Authorities — 1-26
- II. The Θεὸς ἀπὸ Μυχαίνης in  
Greek Literature. .... 28-35
- III. Euripides's Literary Attitude  
toward the Gods. .... 37-144
- IV. Euripides not inevitably condemned  
by Aristotle's Remarks. Antecedents  
of the Deus ex Machina. Analogies.  
Frequency in other ancient Literature. 146-171
- V. Enquiry for an Artistic Motive.  
Prominence of the Fate Idea  
in Speeches of the Dei ex Machina. 173-185
- VI. Fate and Fortune in Greek  
Literature. Terms Employed. .... 187-200
- VII. Fate and Fortune in Euripides. .... 202-232
- VIII. Irony in Euripides.  
a) Of General Human Experience,





# Contents - Concluded.

pp.

- b) Of Hope and Expectation,
- c) In Language.

Brief Comparison of Fate and Tragic  
in Sophocles ..... 234-280

IV. Irregular Cases of Deus ex Machina ..... 282-286

V. Exposition of the Ironical Element  
as found in the Euripidean Deus ex  
Machina ..... 288-296

Discussion of Peculiarities of Detail  
in the Prophecies ..... 296-304

VI. Structure of the Speeches of Dei  
ex Machina. Analyses. .... 306-325

VII. Analogous μηχαναί. The  
Medea; the Rhesus; the Philoctetes. 327-335

Bibliography ..... 336-339

Life ..... 340-341





# Opinions of Modern Authorities.

Epitome - Bender  
Perry only in passage

Bellefleur -

Möller -

Bernhard

Bayer

Cross

Mohr - with heavy suggestion

Rich - with some new





The frequency of the deus ex machina, a device wholly discredited in modern times, in the dramas of Euripides has proved a stumbling-block to more than one scholar of the present day who wished to be a whole-hearted admirer of the great Athenian poet. The subject of the following paper presented itself to the writer's mind after a perusal of A. W. Verrall's Euripides the Rationalist (Cambridge, 1895), as a result of doubts aroused by his observations on the dénouement by means of a theophany. This book, with the conclusions of which I cannot in all soberness agree, is nevertheless valuable as opening up new vistas of thought and illuminating the study of the tragedian from different angles.





In the first place, for purposes of general reference, as well as to illustrate the utter contrast and confusion of prevailing views, it will be profitable to accomplish the juxtaposition of such accounts of the phenomenon as are offered by writers on Greek Literature.

Most remarkable is the weight attached to a dictum of A. W. Schlegel's, - himself not a specialist in the classical field, - and the influence it has exerted throughout the philological world. In his Vorlesungen über dramatische Literatur und Kunst (about 1837), he asserted:

"Die Göttererscheinungen hat Euripides so benutzt und abgemischt, dass unter seinen sieben Tragödien in neun eine Gottheit zur völligen Lösung des



Knotens herabschreiben muss."

The last words, - "herabschreiben muss," - stand in sad need of verification. According to the above estimate the poet was supposed to compose along in an easy, reckless fashion until he had brought his characters into such a sorry tangle that he was compelled to extricate himself and them by pseudo-divine means. Largely from Schlegel, perhaps, has come the further idea of a Knot, and untying the Knot or cutting the Knot, which is fairly proverbial in connection with the deus ex machina.

Milder judgments, to be sure, have been expressed somewhat early in the century. Jacobs (quoted by Schrader<sup>1</sup>) though thinking that the Euripidean use of the μηχανή denoted lack of art or a mistake in the

1. The reference to Schrader's article is on p. 17 of this dissertation.





choice of action, revised it in some cases  
with an innocent addition, in others  
calculated to connect the action with  
patriotic motives. Thackeray, it would seem,  
regarded the deus at the end of a number  
of pieces as a necessary link between what  
was portrayed in the play and outside  
facts that were known and had to be  
important. See also Schrader's mention of  
Fitzgibbon.

Bernhardt<sup>3</sup> II<sub>2</sub> pp. 736-37 in his  
History of Greek Literature (1872) says: "The Epi-  
logue is, according to his [Euripides's] fashion,  
essentially akin to the Prologue. A last scene  
was necessary to reconcile by a moral  
conclusion the warring interests, as soon as  
the action by reason of the catastrophe had  
reached its utmost tension. True enough, Euripides





understands how to set his picture of passion and  
 desire into continuous motion, but he seldom  
 arrives at a pure solution of the thorough discords;  
 contemplation is seldom exalted and cannot give  
 satisfactory look into moral laws with which  
 the freedom of will can agree. Occasionally  
 resignation finds such a conclusion: more  
 frequently the stage of passions and passions mounts  
 to lofty heights where peace cannot issue  
 from inner cognizance, but where, in  
 order to satisfy moral claims, or merely for  
 the sake of a theatrical ending, that god who  
 most naturally intervenes in the story rises  
 by machinery above men's heads, scatters  
 commandments, the clustering doubts, or still  
 sooner appears them through an announce-  
 ment of fate (which elsewhere this tragedy has  
 excluded) or of the future. In many cases the



method arises over it to protect the interest of the public in the matter, and to round out the course of the myth. This misuse appears most strikingly in the Tragicomedies, where two conflicting divinities are placed at the extremities of the drama, - prologue and epilogue, and make the pathologic nature of the theme weak as well as lacking in independence. Euripides has, however, accustomed himself fully to such figures of the stage, and even where the hero (as in the Bacchae) should grow from a well-founded theme and from inner necessity, the poet returns to his mechanism. Such a tragedy becomes scarcely endurable when closing the confused tumult of figures in the trochae and the Electra. Applications of the gods perform more fitting service in patriotic themes, where the people of the future





of others a good or agreeable sort of conclusion and the epilogue speaks some brilliancy over the ancestral city; such a matter also suggested for the Ion, in which a satisfactory outcome was determined almost by the very plan of the drama. Then, however, this person Sen ex machina after all is found to be merely hewing asunder the Knot, when his employment clearly declares that human wisdom is exhausted, he then proceeds to show how little Euripides drew from his speculation a constructive principle of dramatic art, and how useless he was about carrying out a consistent plan." - Like Schlegel, Thurnhamer looks upon the poet as a quite unavoidable exponent.

Bergk's couple and searching work on Greek Literature (1872-87) does not treat the subject





in which we are now interested. There is seemingly a gap in the manuscript at the point where such a discussion would have been natural. *See below in margin*

Michaëlis in his History of Classical Greek Literature (1880) I. p. 381 tells us: "The [sc. Euripides] adopted a distinct method which Sophocles imitated in his œuvres and Philæta - of curtailing the opening and close of his plays, in order to expand more fully the affecting & striking scenes in the body of the play. This was attained, first by the prologue \*\*\*\*\*. Secondly, the deus ex machina, who appeared at the end, loosed the knot, & reconciled the conflict of the actors. Compare the statement of Terens, below. Michaëlis goes on to promulgate a rather curious theory: "The appearance of a god at the end was likewise



a sign that the play was over, for it was long plain what he would say, and the last words of the chorus [the response is to ἡδδαῖ, ὑππαὶ τῶν Σαυορίων κτλ.] were even the same in several of the plays, being evidently not heard in the noise of the general rising of the crowd."—He apparently fails to reflect that one tragedy might be followed by another, & be comedy, without the spectators leaving their seats.

The views of K. v. Müller, as set forth in the Müller-Hits (forth) edition (Gr. Lit. gesch. I, p. 597) are as follows: "As to the deus ex machina, this is for the end of the Euripidean drama practically the same thing as the monologue already mentioned for the beginning—a symptom that the dramatic action has lost the principle of natural development and is no longer capable of creating out of itself





beginning, middle, and end in satisfactory connection. When the poet by means of the prologue has made comprehensible the situation, as a result of which the principal personage is affected by some passion and there is a battle of opposing efforts, then he brings forward all kinds of developments through which this battle becomes ever hotter, the play of passions ever more confused, and in the midst of all this is frequently unable to find any point in the impassioned actions of the characters where a definite goal, whether the decisive victory of the one party or peace and reconciliation of the struggling interests could be introduced. Then appears a divinity, borne at least the breeze on a machine, announces the will of fate, and restores by its authority a peaceful and happy situation. Very gradually



meanwhile did Euripides become free in the use of these conclusions; his first-pieces find a close without deus ex machina; then follow dramas in which the action reaches its goal by means of the participating characters, and the god only enters in addition to solve every doubt and secure a complete pacification of spirit; only towards the end of his career did Euripides consent to throw all the weight upon the deus ex machina so that through it alone an otherwise inextricable skein of human passions is — not untangled but drawn asunder. Whatever is lacking in inner spiritual contentment the poet seeks to replace by external, sensual means, by introducing the divine in an astonishing and often at the first moment terrifying manner, mighty in size and illumined with brilliance, and





also at the same time admit to now and then the additional influence of other apparatuses of surprising quality, which could not have been produced without certain optical arts."

Bender (1888) in chapter 19 of his book has nothing to say directly of the deus ex machina, but remarks that Euripides is the poetic representative of the Periclean age; that his working out of the effectiveness of individual scenes injured the economy of the whole.

Terrens (1886) on p. 225 thus records his opinion: "The object with which the deus ex machina is made to intervene is tolerably apparent. The poet thus gains much time which would otherwise be spent in unravelling the plot. This on the whole is - probably also the object with which the prologue is written. \*\*\*\*\*  
In both cases the motive seems to have been



to give as little time as possible to the myth as traditionally related, in order to concentrate attention on incidents and situations of Euripides's own making. Euripides could not throw off the myths altogether, but got rid of them as much as possible by relegating them to the deus ex machina. Whatever the motive with which these two devices were used, they are none the less bad art."

More acute, perhaps, are the observations of Gaillet (III 200-7). The deus ex machina is "the faithful representative of the caprice of the gods, who have no other the limit, at which the chorus can contentedly sing: Τῶν δ' ἰδοκῆται πῶρον εἶπε θεός. Intended by established rules Euripides makes use of the deus ex machina, as if it belonged to the ordinary tools of the tragedians, so that a comedian is not far





wrong when he ridicules the tragedians for  
summing up a god whenever they are in need."  
"But the invention of the deus ex machina is not  
chargeable to the account of Euripides." Instances  
are then cited from Criseides (fragments) and  
Iphigeneia (fragments and Philoctetes). This frequency  
of the deus ex machina, Little continues, was due  
to the fact that belief in the gods was, at the  
time of the old masters, still plastic and living.  
He instances the aid of Apollo, Pan, and the  
Sisacari in the Persian war, the nocturnal  
winds of Asclepius, Homer's recital of active  
divine help. Caliban similarly employed a  
deus ex machina because he and his people  
believed thoroughly in miracles. "For then," he  
concludes, "should a man of the fourth century, to  
whom blind chance seemed to guide all human  
affairs, see in those gods anything else than



a convenient tool of the dramatist?"

Plav (pp. 725-6) again makes reference to the simple faith of Calderon, and adds: "it was that Euripides, by assigning this important influence to the gods, expressed the great or common sentiment of his audience that their interference in human affairs was possible, or that in the past it had been possible. What to Aeschylus had been implied by the course of affairs now, in later days, seemed like a miracle, not a natural event. Fate seemed to ~~vanish~~, what had once been plain, that the divine control produced good fortune insensibly. At this time it was necessary to show that the appearance of the gods was fitful and intermittent. Their intervention was homage to their power, and only in this way could their authority be conceived. \*\*\*\* Crude as maybe





the pen of Euripides, it is evident that it betokens a different view of the old question of responsibility for sin. In *Æschylus*, and even in the earlier plays of *Sophocles*, there are abundant signs of the survival of the notion that guilt is an inherited thing, that may be atoned for vicariously, while the later growth of individuality produced in the plays of Euripides a sense of personal responsibility which demanded the separate appearance of the gods if their control of events was to receive any sort of recognition.

The apparent clumsiness of his device is but the inevitable result of its novelty; what is done for the first time is sure to be ill done. The masterly skill of his predecessors only makes it clear that they employed generally accepted methods of accounting for the tragic discord."



Lehrst (3<sup>rd</sup> edit. 1895, p. 271) speaks of the deus ex machina as a pendant to the prologue. The method of Euripides is described as "unif<sup>or</sup>m" and "easy," and the writer adds that although the first introduction of the device must have attracted attention, yet it often concerns but ill either haste or lack of talent.

With this series of excerpts from the more important Literary Histories in mind we may now proceed to a review of some few special treatises.

Hermann Schrader's essay entitled Zur Würdigung des deus ex machina der griechischen Tragödie was contributed to the Rheinisches Museum in two parts, for the years 1867 and 1868 (Vol. XXII, pp. 544-64 and Vol. XXIII, pp. 103-124). His main object is to reconcile these gods in Euripides with two laws laid down by later



writers on dramatic theory: first Aristotle's, that the *mythos* must be derived from what is outside the play, - history or prophecy; and second Horace's (*Arts Poetica* v. 191), that the crisis must be worthy of the divinity. - The former will be fully discussed in the present paper: the latter I regard as of too late a date to be authoritative for the fifth century B.C.

Schraeder, then, takes up the plays separately. The first two which he handles are the Philoctetes of Sophocles and the Cretans of Euripides, in which the reason assigned for the introduction of the god is that the story had run a somewhat irregular course and had to be reconciled finally with the accepted form of the myth. As he goes on, however, the point on which he lays stress is the prophecy in the speeches of the dei, and eventually he includes the two above pieces





in the same category with the rest. From his investigation he evolves the theory that the employment of divine interposition at the drama's end is a substitute for the development of a myth by means of trilogy, or an inevitable result of the decadence of Trilogic arrangement.

The Thaïs, Epigonia, Helen, Ton, Suppliants, Andromache and Electra he groups together as showing certain similarities in the matter of divine action. In each the god appears only after everything has come to a nature, satisfying close. The fugitives in the Epigonia Thaïs had gotten safely away, but were driven back to land again; in the Helen, after the successful escape of Menelaus and Helen, King Theoclymenus turns with unexpected fierceness on his sister; in the Ton the sudden doubt which seizes the young man, moving



him to invade the temple 'wholly of holes and call Apollo to account, might have been removed in some gentle fashion.

The other three plays just mentioned present instances of the deus ex machina with absolutely no effect on the action. In the Suppliants Theseus is about to dismiss Atrastus in peace; Athena causes the departing guest to take an oath of perpetual peace: in the Andromacha Pelius, sunk in grief, is comforted by Helen who brings a bright vision of delectation soon to be: in the Electra Clytemnestra has followed husband and lover into Hades before the Dioscuri approach, simply to make known the things which must come to pass. — From all this Schraaer draws the important deduction that Euripides was not forced by the





rush of incidents to cut his way out, but employed the unvarnished purpose.

Next in order of discussion is the Tragedy, which the author admits to be of a different constitution from the preceding works. The appearance of Helen is justified on the ground that Helen must learn the truth: the chorus would not tell, the nurse would not be believed. To whatever degree her intervention is unusual and unlike the other cases which have been observed, such unlikeliness should be condoned on the ground that she is not the ordinary was ex machine at all, but one of the standing characters of the piece.

As for the Tragedy Tragedy Schiller deems the descent of Iris and Lyssa in the middle of the drama to afford a certain motivation for the subsequent madness of the hero without



Their answer we should have no way of knowing  
where his dreadful affliction came.

According to the decision reached is that  
Purshardt was wrong in maintaining that Empi-  
rides by his use of the god from the machine  
is shown to have no constructive principle;  
one might even assert the opposite. Aristotle's  
law is rather completely obeyed. — This same  
opinion is voiced by Henri Weil (Etudes sur  
le Same antique, p. 131).

A short time after Schrader's article  
there appeared three separate dissertations that  
concerned themselves with the subject in hand.  
They are reviewed in Bavarian's Jahrbuch  
(Vol. III, p. 401 and pp. 445-6). That of Lühr  
is the only one to which I have had access.

1) Tucklenbeck in a seventeen page quarto  
programme (1874) decides that Empires wished



to give the actor an effective look. The suddenness of the apparition, the thunder, lightning, and shining costumes gratified the masses' desire for show. He thinks that Goethe's last, if interpreted to mean that the waxwork is in order when sufficient ground can be shown for its employment accords well enough with Aristotle's deductions, but to say that it is allowable only when no other solution is possible is not authorized by any writer.

2) Wisemann the same year in a programme of Regensburg corroborated the view of Tucklenbeck. Euripides was pandering to the people's love of the spectacular, and desired to surprise them by a pompous closing effort.

3) Schür in 1875 went beneath the external, and criticised Chröder's theory that the deus ex machina represented myth-extension by





Trilogy. In *Agamemnon* he makes the dove a symbol of that divine power which leads to victory what is good in the world. In *Euripides*, where the solution requires a god to intervene the poet is solving a tragic problem with epic means, as might be expected of an author who stands so closely related to the epic: the objection "poor economy" would not therefore have been valid. Either plays end with a *κατακλιθεὶς* prayer that the god may award the justice and justice for the sake of the *καθάρσις*.

Since that decade (1870-80) little work evidently has been done along this line. Verrall is reserved for another chapter. The *Revue des Revues* for 1877 (Vol. 21, p. 136) reports from Bohemia a tract by Fr. Škoda, the title of which (as rendered into French) is Le Deus ex Machina à la Fin des Tragédies d'Euripide.

1. Accompanying the *Revue de Philologie*



it as Causes. The reviewer (F. H. L.) says of it  
 trivial: "rien de nouveau". And to bring mat-  
 ters a little nearer to date, there was published in  
 June, 1877, the first volume of Etudes sur  
l'Artisan Lira by Elias Lindskog. A review  
 may be found in the Revue of the 15th of  
 June, Feb. 10, 1879, which gives us to under-  
 stand that on p. 10 ff. considerable is said  
 about the deus ex machina. The reviewer  
 himself, Théo Tuvola, enters the well-worn  
 belief that Euripides suffered under the yoke  
 which obliged him to portray life in the  
 saga-form, long consecrated by tradition, and  
 that to make his composition agree with the  
 myth he had recourse to the violent means  
 of a god from the machine. — But it  
 seems hardly clear how a person can term  
 Euripides in general a weak innovator, and





Still before, in case he felt so heavily the burden  
of transition) that he did not take the  
initiative, as did Agathon, in introducing new  
subjects for drama.



*The*  
Θεὸς ἀπὸ Μηχανῆς  
*in*  
*Greek Literature.*



Ancient notices on the subject are not very numerous. In view, then, of the small quantity there is need of especial care in judging the quality. The earliest source is Plato, who in Cratylus (425 D) practically brings a charge of inefficiency against the dramatists. Socrates is the speaker:-

οὐ γὰρ ἔχουμεν τούτου βέλτιον, εἰς ὃ τι ἐπανεγκωμεν περὶ ἀληθείας τῶν πρώτων ὀνομάτων, εἰ μὴ ἡρα βούλει, ὥσπερ οἱ τραγωδοί, ἐπειδὴν τι ἀπορῶσιν, ἐπὶ τὰς μηχανὰς καταφεύγουσι θεοῦς ἔροντες, καὶ ἡμεῖς" κτλ.

The passage is translated by Cicero (N. D. I, 20, 53) thus:-

"ut tragici poetae, cum explicare argumenti exitum non possent, confugitis ad deum."

Furthermore, in the Leucitophon, belonging to





The *Pantheist* corpus, seen in the following  
line (407A):-

ἐγὼ γάρ, ὦ Σώκρτες, σοὶ συγγνωσκῶ  
πολλὰκις ἐξ ἐπληττάνων ἀκούων, καὶ μοι ἐδόκει  
παρὰ τοὺς ἄλλους ἀνθρώπους κάλλιστα λέγειν,  
ὅποτε ἐπιτιμῶν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ὥσπερ ἐπὶ  
μηχανῆς τραγικῆς θεός, ὕμνεις λέγων·  
ποῦ φέρεσθε, ἄνθρωποι... κτλ. (*cf.* *Athena*  
*in the Phrygiana* *hymn* of Euripides, v. 1435:-  
ποῦ ποῦ Σιωχμὴν τόνδε πορθαεύεις, ἄναξ;).

Yet Euripides was enjoying in Plato's  
time, as throughout all subsequent antiquity,  
the highest favor, and the great philosopher  
himself is not prevented from declaring  
(*Rep.* VIII, 568A):- οὐκ ἐτός, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, ἢ τε  
τραγῳδία ὅδ' αὖ σοφὸν δοκεῖ εἶναι καὶ ὁ Εὐρι-  
πίδης διαφέρων ἐν αὐτῇ. Besides, the  
fact has to be borne in mind that these



two dialogues, although the time of their composition is by no means fixed, date probably from about 372 (the Cratylus) and 375 (Cleitophon). The adverse references can, therefore, scarcely be applied to Euripides, who died about 406. They are rather directed against the swarm of younger aspirants to whom Aristophanes' (Ranæ 92-3) calls ἐπιφροῦδίδες, στρωμάδατα, χεδιόνων, μουσεῖα, δωβηταὶ τέχνης.

Aristophanes of middle comedy (circ. 387 B.C.) in Πλοῦτος (Meineke I. p. 542) contrasts his own hard lot with that of the tragedians, who

ἵσταρ καὶ δὲν δύνωντ' εἰπεῖν ἔτι, | κομισθῆ  
δ' ἀπειρήκωσιν ἐν τοῖς δράμασιν, | ἔρρουσιν  
ὥσπερ δάκτυλον τὴν μηχανὴν, | καὶ τοῖς θεωμέ-  
νοισιν ἀποχρώντως ἔχει.

The succeeding citations are all of them

1. It may be worth observing that Aristophanes, with all his carping at the Prologues of Euripides, has nothing to say against the deus ex machina, which some of the younger comedians so belabored.





still later, and hence have even less bearing on the Periclean age.

Herander (Frag. 226 - II, p. 712 - Meineke) has: ἀπὸ ἀρχανῆς θεὸς ἐπεφάνης.

In the fourth century Demosthenes (p. 1025 fin.) brings it in as a proverb:

Τευκράτος δὲ μῦθος, ὥσπερ ἀπὸ ἀρχανῆς, μαρτυρεῖ μὲν τεκμήριον ἔστιάσθαι τοῦτω τὸν εὖν πατέρα - κτλ.

And about the same time was issued the famous dictum of Aristotle (Politics XV, 7):

Φανερόν οὖν ὅτι καὶ τὰς ἀφ᾽ αὐτῶν ἐξ αὐτοῦ δεῖ τὸ μῦθον συρρίναι, καὶ μὴ --- ἀπὸ ἀρχανῆς.

Over a hundred years later Polybius makes some very severe criticisms upon the ignorance of certain superstitious historians, who, knowing nothing of the origin country or previous passage



had asserted that some god or hero must have led Hannibal's army across that region. He then takes occasion to remark (Histories, III, 48, 8):

ἐξ ὧν εἰκότως ἐπιπίπτουσιν εἰς τὸ παραπλήσιον τοῖς τραυδεογγραφοῖς. καὶ γὰρ ἐκείνοις πᾶσιν αἱ καταστροφαὶ τῶν δρᾶμάτων προσδέονται θεῶν καὶ μηχανῆς διὰ τὸ τὰς πρώτας ὑποθέσεις ψευδεῖς καὶ παραλόγους λαμβάνειν, τοὺς τε συγγραφέας ἀνάγκη τὸ παραπλήσιον πάσχειν καὶ ποιεῖν ἥρωας τε καὶ θεοὺς ἐπιφανιμένους, ἐπειδὴν τὰς ἀρχὰς ἀπιθάνους καὶ ψευδεῖς ὑποστήσωνται. πῶς γὰρ εἶναι τε παραλόγους ἀρχὰς εὐλογον ἐπιθεῖναι τέλους;  
The word πᾶσιν in the passage makes it probable that Polybius is referring solely to his contemporaries.

A simile in Lucian (Philopseud. 329) has a form very similar to Demosthenes:

καὶ τὸ τοῦ λόγον, θεὸν ἀπὸ μηχανῆς ἐκείνους



πολλὰ εἶναι μοι τοῦτον ἄνθρωπον ὑπὸ τῆς τύχης.

Finally Lucian, somewhere in the twelfth century of our era, summed up what he knew about the matter as follows (S.V. ἀπὸ μηχανῆς):—

ἐπὶ τῶν παραβίων καὶ παραλόγων. οἱ γὰρ τῶν τραγῳδιῶν ποιηταὶ ὅταν εἰσῃγαγον εἰς τὴν σκηνὴν τόλμαν, ὥστε συγχυθῆναι τοὺς θεατὰς πρὸς τὰ εἰρημένα, καὶ ἐλθεῖν τοὺς ἡτυχηκένας δόξαντας ὡς ἀνάδεια πεπονθῆτας, ἢ μισῆσαι τοὺς πεπαιηκότας ἢ παρανυμῆσαντας, εἰώθασι θεοὺς εἰσάγειν, οὐκ ἀπ' αὐτῆς τῆς σκηνῆς ὑδρωμένους, ἀλλ' ἐξ ὕψους ὑπὸ τινος μηχανῆς, ἣν ἔβλεπον κεν πρότερον οἱ θεαταί, κατ' ἐκείνην δὲ τὴν ἡμέραν στρεφόμενῃ ἐδείκνυε τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ πρόσωπον, καὶ τοῦτο καταστολὴν εἶναι τοῦ δράματος. ἐλέγετο δὲ θεὸς ἀπὸ μηχανῆς.

The criticism of Aristotle is to be considered later in this paper. The other sections show





apparently that the use of gods for the solution of plays had produced at first such a favorable impression as to attract a swarm of imitators who employed the device too often in a particularly impudic manner, with the consequence that like the "hero" and "villain" of modern melodrama it became a byword and laughing-stock among the better informed.

The observation may, however, be permitted that our last word on the subject, from antiquity, that of Seneca, is not one of ridicule, but emphasizes rather the feature of poetic justice.

Ancient authors do not afford us positive information as to the beginnings of the deus ex machina, nor state why the great tragedian thought it fitting for their dramas. Such a deus moved in certain pieces of Aeschylus (according, at least, to Little III, 206, note 6 - for the fragments



themselves are a little obscure), but there is no  
 extant play to present an entire situation. Sopho-  
 cles has one case in his Thiostetes, and one or  
 two more in fragments (Guth III, 200, note 1). Euri-  
 pides puts this deity into nine extant plays  
 and into fragments as well. In his works, if  
 anywhere, it should be possible to catch some  
 glimpses of an adequate artistic motive.





Euripides's  
Literary attitude  
towards  
the Gods.



The theory of A. W. Fenall with regard to the pus ex machina may be found in his Twispides the Rationalist, and most concisely in the essay on Epigenia, although indicated as well at other points in the book. [See p. 91; pp. 167-73; pp. 197-201; p. 200; p. 215.] I append a few typical sentences.

"The coups de theatre with which the action is wound up or cut short have almost always a conventionality of manner, a perfunctory style, a looseness of adaptation, a feebleness in thought and feeling, which contrast strangely with the originality, terseness, energy, and passion displayed in other parts of the work." — "The 'divine' performances which terminate the Orestes and Electra seem to be nothing better than farce." — "The true explanation of these



phenomena is ..... that Euripides...  
was compelled and expected to use irony, and  
to present his real opinions and sentiments  
under the veil of a penetrable disguise." -  
His real opinions, according to Verrill, were  
highly atheistic, and he desired them to  
spread. - "Experienced readers of Athens  
must have known that in Euripides what  
had been spoken from the machine was  
not to be taken seriously, \* \* \* \* but  
[was] a mere concession to the requirements  
of a theatrical stage and its established  
tradition."

On this Prof. H. L. Childs (Oration  
LXI, p. 137, ed. 1) observes: "One cannot help  
asking how the poet could have got a chorus,  
for it is not to be supposed that the officials  
were less clever than the average Athenian;





and \*\*\*\*\* the long time attitude of Euripides in the handling of myths would have been too great a scandal to be tolerated in a religious performance such as was the Greek tragedy.

It is doubtless to this theory that Mr. Lewis Campbell adverts (Religion in Greek Literature, pp. 303-4), when he says: "It is agreed that so accomplished an artist in producing works so anomalous must have done so with profound design. The tragic poet was still, it is assumed, the teacher of his age; but the age could not hear the lesson which he desired to impart. It was therefore given to insinuate this, under the ancient forms, so moulding the legends as to make it manifest to the more intelligent amongst his countrymen that those forms were morally untenable



and inconsistent with the highest notion of the divine, while they were yet so handled as to entertain the common herd and to excite their emotions. \*\*\*\*\* I venture to think that in all this the poet is taken too seriously. It appears to me that in the latter part of the fifth century, no longer the tragic poets, but the rhetorician and the sophist, were the acknowledged teachers of the age. Sophocles . . . . . belonged to the previous generation. The task of Euripides was rather to interest than to instruct. What Plato calls the Theatreocracy or tyranny of the audience had already begun." - And Campbell adds something of his own (p. 305):  
"To ask whether Euripides believed in his version of the story of Orestes is like asking whether Milton believed in the fall of the





rebellious angels, or Wagner in the Venusberg and the swan-chariot of Lohengrin. In popular belief the fables had still enough of substance and of actual hold to be accepted when embroidered afresh by the fancy of the poet." — A subsequent paragraph (p. 308) falls probably further short of the truth:-

"The interference of the gods to bring disaster to a happy end, so often represented in Euripidean drama, had less reality, both for the poet and his audience, than the sorrowful complications which had preceded. It was a requirement of the contemporary stage, but had more to do with the framework, than with the substance of the art. It was adapted to the weakness of those who could not bear a story to end badly, and must have led simple minds





to 'painter trust the larger hope', but could leave no impression on the thoughtful spectator, compared to that of the troubles which had moved his sympathy."

To return now to Verrall - here are other crystallized ideas. "In the Sphinx the poet has deliberately used the 'jokers' of the finale as the vehicle of a jocular allusion." - "She, and with her necessarily, the whole finale from her appearance, stands confessed as a mere piece of theatrical machinery, a device introduced only with a view to the conditions of the performance; and the reader is assumed to know this." - "Even 'Athens' is not allowed to save the piece's victims except by a faint so credibly arbitrary that she can scarcely speak it for laughing." Finally, - "Athens



microcosm, a story of incident, leading up to the theophany accepted as the development really intended by the author. . . . it [the Epiphany] is not worthy, and to an average assembly it cannot appear worthy, of an author who claims to stand with Aeschylus and with Sophocles." — Again, of the Ton (p. 164) he says: "The piece is not wounded off, but chopped off, and there (if you leave it there) is an end of the matter."

In short, wherever a god appears from the machine the intention is to make that god seem unreal, his intervention ridiculous, to throw ridicule upon him, and thereby to bring discredit upon the entire anthropomorphic system. Something of the sort had been suggested long before by Mr. Pater (Studies



sur les Tragiques Grecs I, p. 14) who says:  
"Serait-il téméraire de prétendre, qu'Euripide, qui, tout en usant, comme poète, des croyances de sa patrie et de son temps, ne s'interdisait pas de témoigner qu'elles repugnaient à sa raison, à vouloir, lorsqu'il les a ainsi présentes aux regards dans toute leur nudité, protester indirectement contre elles?" an explanation approved by Barthold (Edit. Hippol. Introd. p. XXXIX). Patin, however, with a subtle French sense of *under à par* did not proceed to such extremes as the English scholar.

The question instantly arises, - if Euripides pursued such a method, has he not spoiled a work of art to teach a moral, and is not that essentially un-Greek? This question Mr. Verrill attempts to answer in





175 ff., and he has done so in an eminently  
 unsatisfactory fashion. His procedure is  
 almost everywhere too microscopic: everywhere  
 he detects some hidden meaning lurking.  
 It must be his fixed point for but  
 one play. It still remains to be seen whether  
 in each drama Euripides employs his  
 curious contamination of incident and atheism,  
 the former a rope to the superstitious, the  
 latter a delicate moral for the consumption  
 of fine minds.

I am far from desiring to show that the  
 poet was orthodox. A reflective mind in the  
 flux and flow of his age can scarcely have  
 escaped doubts. But I cannot find that a  
 perusal of his works gives any ground for  
 believing that he introduced personal ideas of  
 religion in an unfitting way. It admitted



his composition as a drama: the medium there-  
for, which was limited to myths, he accepted.  
Did he use it for creating a piece of artistic  
literature, or subordinate such a purpose to an  
involved promulgation of free-thinking? The  
plays themselves must throw light on this  
point. If the second hypothesis is true, we  
should expect at all events a certain burning  
down of the religious or anthropomorphic ele-  
ment. The ordinary run of personages ought  
not to be too sincere, or overwhelmingly pious,  
lest they lead us involuntarily astray from  
the main issue. If, on the other hand, we  
encounter a majority of devout believers (after  
the human kind), - shaken sometimes in  
their faith by unusual disaster, as men are  
wont to be, but in general clinging tenaciously  
to the old forms, - we may then feel



reasonable sure that another the personal  
tastes of Euripides, he was willing enough to  
let the heroic atmosphere of his story be a  
genuine and not a sham one, and that a  
god may retain his face value as a god,  
without being debased into such an Empusa  
as Christophanes has described (Ramus 205 ff.).

The order followed is that of Chénier's  
edition<sup>1</sup>. The plan is to cite expressions of opinion  
from the acting characters.

### Alcestis.

v. 218. The semi-chorus is evidently  
composed of relatives, for they say, with reference  
to the death of Alcestis:

Σῆδ' αὖν, αἰετοῖ, Σῆδ' ἄρ' ἄλλ' ἄνθρωποι  
ἄποισιν εὐχόμεσθα. Ἄεθ' γὰρ δούρατος ἀνέστην.

1. Throughout this paper the Prologos is left out of account.  
Cf. p. 330-





whereupon the entire body breaks out in an  
appeal to Aesc, the heavenly physician (cf. v.  
92).

v. 251. Admetus urges his wife:

λίσσοι δὲ τοὺς κρατοῦντας σὺν τεύραι θεοῖς

v. 998. The Chorus are again strongly rhetorical  
in expression. If Chloë they say

θεοῖσι δ' οὐδὲν τρυφῶ.

v. 1135 Sir. Verall says of Pericles (p. 22) that  
he is "not by any means strong in religion, pre-  
siding in this respect in instructive contrast  
to his friend Admetus, whose piety is his forte."  
If so, it is rather surprising to hear his  
wish thus phrased:

φθόρος δὲ μὴ γέναιτό τις θεῶν.

The suspicion is also suggested "that,  
however he might feel in moments of peculiar  
mental and physical stimulus (v. 834), the



cool-headed, for he most often has Roman misgivings about the superhuman parentage attributed to himself." But notice a passage of less stimulus (vv. 1119-20), where the hero advises

ἄϊ, σῶζε νῦν, καὶ τὸν Διὸς  
 φάος ἦν παῖδα γερνῶν ἕενν.

Character, as Mr. Törwall seems ready to admit, hardly so recognizes him (vv. 509 and 1136).

Additional instances of the faith of members of the chorus may be found in addresses to Zeus (v. 213), to Hades the black-minded god (though anthropomorphic) at v. 737, to Phobos (v. 584), to Hermes (v. 743). Phobos is now again mentioned by the chorus (v. 961), as well as "Apollo of the sweet lyre" (in accordance with usual representations of the god) at v. 570.

Even, Pericles, the supposedly unreligious court



use such a matter of fact phrase as τὰ  
ἀγροδία (or the like) in speaking of love, but  
must needs put it in this way (vv. 790-91):

τίνα δὲ καὶ τὰν πλεῖστον ἑδίσταν θεῶν  
κύπρον, βαπτισιν· εὐμενὴς γὰρ ἡ θεός.

The pious character continues pious even  
to his exclamations. Cf. πρὸς θεῶν (vv. 275,  
382, 1064), ὦ θεοί (v. 1123).

But this world of quiet faith Tórrail is  
for introducing the insincerity of atheism.  
There is no Thamus with whom, Francis was  
obliged to wrestle, though the hero himself blinks  
the question in a rather shameless fashion.  
Tórrail is particularly displeased at the  
absence of detail in regard to the contest.  
But just as sometimes he reads too much  
into the lines, so here he reads too much  
out of them (pp. 65-74). His examination of





the scene will show that the main thing upon the mind of Adam is the actual recovery of his wife. He is too much overcome by surprise at the reality of the figure before him to enquire carefully into details, and the structure of whichomys at this point does not favor an independent recital by Tracks. Then, before Adam has fully recovered his senses, his benefactor is gone.

Terrall likewise objects (p. 60) that it is little to the purpose for Tracks to send Adam a lecture on manners, when he has just brought up a woman from the dead. But herein he apparently fails of the true conception. The whole action just here is sketched. Tracks has completed his task at Phere: he must on to another elsewhere. The word 'add' (v. 1177), as regularly, indicates a new subject.



narrative is over: farewell in v. 161. It is  
as a part of this farewell in which solely  
that Heracles gives his admonition (or re-  
buke, as you choose):

τὸ λοιπὸν, Ἄδωνι, εὐσεβεῖ περὶ Ζέου.

### Andromache.

v. 163. Hermione to Andromache:

ἦν δ' οὖν βροτῶν τίς σ' ἢ θεῶν σῶσαι θέλει;

v. 258 Andromache replies to the threats of  
Hermione with

οὐ δ' οὖν κόταθε· θεοὶ γὰρ εἶδονταί τ' αὖτε.

v. 269 The cure for serpents' venom she  
regards as the gift of a god:

ἔρπετων μὲν ἀγρίων

ἄκνη βροτοῖσι θεῶν καυστῆσαι τινα.

v. 276 ff., v. 281. The chorus take for granted  
the old story of a supernatural cause for the



woes of Troy.

v. 414 Helenus also chooses the anthropomorphic phrase for death, when she says  $\sigma\tau\epsilon\lambda\omega\ \pi\rho\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \text{Αἴδαν}$ ,

v. 439. She tries to impress Menelaus with a fear of divine vengeance:

$\tau\alpha\ \theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\ \delta'\ \o\upsilon\ \theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\ \text{'}\sigma\acute{o}\delta'\ \epsilon\chi\epsilon\iota\nu\ \eta\gamma\epsilon\acute{\iota}\ \delta\iota\kappa\alpha\nu$ ;

v. 680 Menelaus says:

$\text{'Ελένη}\ \delta'\ \epsilon\ \mu\acute{\alpha}\chi\eta\sigma\text{'}\ \sigma\acute{\upsilon}\chi\ \epsilon\kappa\o\upsilon\sigma\text{'}\ \alpha\delta\delta'\ \epsilon\kappa\ \theta\epsilon\omega\acute{\nu}$ .

vv. 759-60 Pelus also in *Phthia*, summoning "by the grace of god":

$\theta\epsilon\omega\acute{\nu}\ \gamma\alpha\rho\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\chi'\ \epsilon\pi\pi\epsilon\kappa\o\upsilon\ \tau'\ \omicron\chi\lambda\omicron\upsilon\sigma\epsilon$   
 $\pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\omega\acute{\nu}\ \theta'\ \omicron\pi\lambda\iota\tau\omega\acute{\nu}\ \acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\ \Phi\theta\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu\ \kappa\acute{\alpha}\tau\alpha$ .

vv. 851-2 The nurse believes that misfortunes, too, are sent from above:

$\sigma\upsilon\nu\phi\omicron\rho\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \theta\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\tau\omicron\iota$   
 $\pi\alpha\sigma\iota\nu\ \beta\rho\omicron\tau\omicron\iota\sigma\iota\nu\ \grave{\eta}\ \tau\omicron\tau'\ \grave{\eta}\lambda\theta\omicron\nu\ \grave{\eta}\ \tau\omicron\tau\epsilon$ .

v. 901 Creusa, newly married, enquires whether Hermione's troubles are caused by gods or mortals.





πρὸς θεῶν ἢ βροτῶν πάσχεις κακά;

And she responds (vv. 902-3):

τὰ μὲν πρὸς ἡμῶν, τὰ δὲ πρὸς ἀνδρῶν ὅς μ' ἔχει,

τὰ δ' ἐκ θεῶν τοῦ.

v. 1003 ff. Phoebus is assumed to share equally with Artemis in the continuing cutting off of a Kryptolemus:

οὐδέ νιν μετὰστασις

γνώμας ὀνήσει θεῶ διδόντα νῦν δίκας,

ἀλλ' ἐκ τ' ἐκείνου διαβοδαῖς τε ταῖς ἐμαῖς  
κακῶς ὀλεῖται.

v. 1009 Notice the opening of a hymn to Phoebus and Poseidon, in quite the usual strain.

v. 1031 θεοῦ θεοῦ νιν κέλευσεν' ἐπεσιράφει  
παντόθεν.

v. 1101 ff. The last words of the messenger are a protest against the injustice of Phoebus, who, as in the forecast of Artemis, gets plenty



of credit for the murder. His very wisdom is doubted. This skeptical trend in the play advances as far as v. 1218, when it presently receives a check.

v. 1204 The Chorus feel that the bird has fallen from heaven:

θεοῦ γὰρ αἶσα, θεὸς ἔκπαυε στυγερὰν.

v. 1218 and v. 1251 I wish to call particular attention to this portion of the cyndromacha, because it demonstrates how far Euripides was from interpolating any agnostic views to the detriment of the drama as a work of art. The Chorus at v. 1218 have, through a multiplicity of disasters, almost lost faith in the wisdom and power of the gods, - a decided step in the direction of total unbelief. Then, as if on the principle "it is always darkest just before dawn", and indeed (as I hope to develop) "it is



to an almost systematic recurrence of the unexpected, Thetis appears now twelve lines further on to unfold before Pelus visions of unimagined bliss. The gods are completely vindicated. Euripides has missed the most admirable chance to cast discredit on them by rendering them neglectful of a faithful servant. To the words of the chorus

μᾶταν δέ σ' ἐν γάμοισιν ὤμβισαν θεοί,  
Thetis answers (v. 1251):

καὶ γὰρ θεοῖσι κακείνας μέλει,  
"the gods care for it [they] also", in addition  
to "our race", which had been previously  
mentioned, and the destruction of which formed the  
chief basis of Pelus's lament.

v. 1271 Finally this divine being forbids grief  
for death, since it is from the gods:

πάντες γὰρ ἐν ὕψιμοισιν ἔσθ' ὅπως θέοι





ψῆφος κέρανται κατ' ἑαυτὴν τ' ἐφύλεται.

v. 1283 is a net result of all these proceedings, Thuc. is so confirmed in his orthodoxy as to close the play with the following words (v. 1283):

ὅς γ' ἦν ἡ γὰρ ἔν ἡμέρῃ ἐκ θεῶν κακῶς.

Could anything be less calculated to make converts to atheism?

Religious exclamations occur in this piece also. Cf. vv. 575 (ὅσσαί γε πρὸς θεῶν), 750 (θεοί σοι δοῖεν εὖ), 900 (ὦ Φοῖβ', - - - δοῖας λύειν).

Such, in such a setting the manifestation of a god does not seem out of place.

### Bacchae.

That the tone of the Bacchae is altogether religious only makes the ground we have to cover so much the more difficult treading.



There are some who see herein the great recantation of Euripides: and in so recent an issue of Philologus as N.F. XII (362-700) Wilhelm Christie has a considerable article to prove the contrary. Not the aim of the drama, however, is our chief concern, but only its inner consistency. Religious phrases must therefore be sifted with extreme care.

V. 42 Dionysus, as a god, naturally believes in himself and in other gods. Hence most of his utterances may be thrown out. Still, his evidence is valuable when he shows what he expects the people about him, as a matter of course, to believe. So he lays some stress upon being the son of Zeus (Ζαῖνον, ὅν τέκτει [Ζεῦ πάτερ] Δις). Similarly, in v. 1340, where in a manner evidently intended to impress his hearers he gives his authority



for his predictions:

Ταῦτ' οὐκ ἔκλυτο πατρὶς ἐκ χειρὸς λόγῳ  
Διόνυσος, ἄδδ' αὖ Ζηνός

and in v. 1349, to prove his decree irrevocable:

πάσαι τὰς Ζεὺς οὐκ ἐπείνευθεν πατρὶς.

Three passages, by emphasis laid upon θεός, strongly imply a connotation of power in the word, as ordinarily understood:

v. 47 (spoken by Dionysus),

ὣν εἶνεκ' αὐτῷ θεὸς χειρὶς ἐνδείξομαι.

v. 182 (by Cadmus),

Διόνυσον ὃς πρέφινεν ἀνθρώποις θεός.

v. 1347 (by Dionysus),

καὶ γὰρ πρὸς ὑμῶν θεὸς χειρὶς ὑβριζέμεν.

Dionysus possesses ample faith in the divine power. Of the journey to the mountains, hard for old men, he says to Cadmus (v. 194):—

ὁ θεὸς ἀποχθεὶ κεῖσε νῦν ἡγήσεται.





v. 199 Cadmus in the submission prayer for a mortal:

ὃ κατὰ φρονῖν γινώσκων θεῶν ἄνθρωπος γέναις.

To which Larresias (v. 200) assents:

ὃδὲν σοφὶ δέχομαι τοῖσι δαίμοσι.

v. 203 The Chorus (in this prayer they agree with Cadmus) are shocked at Larresias's avowed intention:

τῆς δυσσεβείας, ἧ γέν', οὐκ αἰδέει θεοῦς;

v. 270 At first sight, the rationalistic touch here is striking. Larresias is speaking of the two primal deities:

Διὰ κτήνη θεά.

γῆ δ' ἔστιν, ὄρουα δ' ὅπότερον βούλει κἀλεῖ

More noteworthy for us, however, is the fact that the user does not insist (as would be opportune for Verrill's argument) upon the rationalistic interpretation, but accords equal respect to the other.

v. 315 Both Larresias and the messenger (v. 773), a man of the people, give to love the anthropo-



morphic designation Κύπρις.

v. 326 The chorus is seen to behave in this way, just as Cadmus (v. 337 ff.) gives credence to the tale of the image of Artemis upon the trees.

The chorus all beginning at v. 370 contains references, made in sincerity, to Ἐπιδες (v. 405), Χάρτες and Πόθος (v. 414) and to οὐρανίδας (v. 374).

v. 467 Pentheus, though incredulous about the Lesbian story, despite of new gods, seems on his remarks to imply a faith in the commonly accepted divinity.

vv. 635-6 There occurs a repetition of the sentiment found in v. 187:-

πρὸς θεὸν γὰρ ὦν ἀνὴρ,  
εἰς μάχην ἔλθειν ἐτόλμας<sup>1</sup>.

Cf. also v. 795,

πρὸς κέντρα λακτίβοιμι θνητὸς ὦν θεῶν.<sup>1</sup>

v. 655 Pentheus, by his explicit words, pro-

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Ion 973.



only answer in the affirmative the question  
 raised in the preceding line :-

τί δ' ; οὐχ' ὑπερβαίνουσι καὶ τεῖχος θεοί ;

v. 764 The messenger gives that for women  
 to put men to flight was οὐκ ἄνευ θεῶν τινα.

v. 876 The invitation of a foe is turned by the chorus:

παρὰ θεῶν γέρας.

iv. 883-6 - ΠΙΣΤΟΝ ΤΙ Τὸ θεῖον

σθένος · ἀπενθύνει δὲ βροτῶν

τοὺς τ' ἀγνωμοσύναν

τελευτᾶ καὶ ... κτε

v. 874 The entire discussion of the exact  
 nature of godhead :-

ὅ τι ποτ' ἄρα τὸ Σαμνόνιον

iv. 1150-51 The messenger who recounts the death  
 of Pentheus draws this moral:

τὸ σωφρονεῖν δὲ καὶ σεβεῖν τὰ τῶν θεῶν  
 κάλλιστον.





Now this need not inevitably be advice to the audience, but from its very place, notwithstanding, at the end of a long speech of over one hundred lines, it carries considerable weight. There may be much to be said in Enripide's opinion (vol. supra) that in Enripide's time the politician had superseded the dramatist as instructor of the populace: still, the play naturally had its effect. In the early history of Philadelphia the theater, owing to popular prejudice, were obliged to announce their melodramas as "sermons" against drunkenness, gambling and the like: the same productions may nowadays serve as sermons, though not so denominated. By the above remarks I merely mean to show that one eager for the spread of rationalism would hardly have placed sentiments of so decided a character in such an impressive portion of his work.



v. 1325-6 The statements just made apply  
equally to the man which Calchas knows;

εἰ δ' ἔστιν ὅστις δαμόνιον ὑπερπεποιθῆ,  
εἰς τοῦδ' ἀθροῖον βαρύνει καὶ τὸν θεόν.

v. 1348 It might appear that Ajax has  
scored a point against the gods in

ὄππῃς πρὸς θεοὺς οὐκ ὀμνοῦσθαι βροτῶν.

The objection is valid, but not the objector.  
In other words, the protest would sound better in the  
mouth of one who had a better cause (cf. v. 26 ff.)—

Siouxu rather ignores the utterance than  
dodges a reply; for in stichomythia alternate  
verses are often closely connected in sense without  
much regard to the intervening line.

### Neubia

v. 58 Spoken by the ghost of Polydorus  
respecting Neubia.



ἡ θεῖρα θεῶν τις τῆς πάρι' εὐπρεσίας.

v. 146 The chorus instruct Andromache how to behave at a symposium:

καίρυσσε θεῶν τοὺς τ' οὐρανίδας  
τοὺς θ' ὑπὸ γαῖαν.

v. 163 Hecuba knows not which path of two to take, or whether she should sit still. Lastly she cries:

ποῦ τις θεῶν  
ἢ δαίμων νῦν ἐπιπαγρός;

vv. 199-201 Polyxena wails

οἶαν οἶαν αὖ σοι δάβαν  
ἐχθρόταν ἀρρήταν τ'  
ᾧπρὲν τις δαίμων.

vv. 721-2 Similarly the chorus to Hecuba:

ὦ Τληπόλε, ὡς σε πολυποντότατον βροτῶν  
δαίμων ἐθάκεν ὅστις ἐστὶ σοι Βαπύς.

v. 799 At the very climax of her ill fortune





Helena still exclaims:

ἀλλ' οἱ θεοὶ θένονσι χεῖρας ἐν κρατῶν  
νόμος.

v. 825 Love personified as Κύπρις.

v. 838 To render effective her petition to  
Olympian the queen longs for a tongue in  
each arm and hand and foot and each of hair,  
ἢ Δαίδαλου τέχναισιν ἢ θεῶν τινας.

v. 852 The prince returns, that he is  
anxious to afford her redress

θεῶν θ' οὐνεκ' ----- καὶ τοῦ Δικαίου.

v. 900 An instance of the personification  
of forces controlling the weather: -

οὐ γὰρ ἔνο' οὐρίας πνύας θεός.

The exclamation πρὸς θεῶν is found in  
vv. 551, 1093, 1127.

There are three passages of a somewhat  
opposite nature, in which the element of



characterisation, - the storm and stress to which the persons are subjected, - must be taken into consideration.

v. 232 Tecuba speaks:

οὐδ' ἴδεσθ' με τίς τρέχει δ' ὅπως ἔρῃ  
κακῶν πάκ' ἄλλα αἰΐσαν' ἢ τάδ' αὖν' ἐγώ.

This is a case of strong emotion, amounting to despair, induced by heavy misfortune.

v. 788 The Tybians, on seeing unexpectedly the once prosperous but now unhappy, Queen grovelling in the dust is moved to the following very natural outcries:-

ὦ Ζεῦ, τί λέξω; πότερ' εἰς ἀνθρώπων ἔρῃ;  
ἢ δόξαν ἄλλως τάνδε κεκτῆσθαι μάτην κτε.

Something like this may be seen even in the Book of Psalms (XXII, 1; LXXXVIII, 17).

v. 958 Polixenor, during a reflection on the uncertainties of life, remarks:



φύροσι δ' αὐτὰ θεὸν πάντες τε καὶ πρόσω  
ταρχῶν ἐντιθέντες.

In each of these cases, although the *tragedy* is occasioned by occurrences outside the usual experience of life, there is the thought that the gods are perhaps unjust towards men, but no doubt is expressed of their existence.

Telemachos.

v. 268 Notice the phrase:

[ὅστις] ----- πρὸς θεῶν κακοῦται.

v. 273 The gods are held responsible for Telemachos's wanderings:-

ἔπειτα πατρίδος θεῶν δ' ἀφ' ἑσέωντο γῆς.

v. 584 To Menelaos the real Telemachos answers the query "who could have formed the evil design?":-

αἰτῶν, ἵνα σὺ θευπόνητ' ἔχεις δέχῃ.

The same words again (v. 585):





τίνας πλάσαντος θεῶν ;

v. 642. The same :

πρὸς ἄλλαν ἐλάμβει θεὸς συμφορὴν τοῦδε κρείσσων.

v. 653 And a little later :-

ἡλίους δὲ κυρίους

κόμης διελθὼν ἠσθάναν τὰ τῆς θεοῦ.

vv. 694-5 Similarly Helen :

ἐμὲ δὲ πατρίδος ἀπο -----

ἔβαλε θεὸς ἀπὸ τε πόλεως ἀπὸ τε δέθεν.

v. 704 Menelaus explains

πρὸς θεῶν δ' ἤμεν ἠπαταμένοι,

and further (v. 708) :-

Ἦρας τὰδ' ἔργα καὶ θεῶν φρονέων ἔργα

vv. 711-13 In view of the whole matter the messenger's conclusion is :

ὦ θυγάτηρ, ὁ θεὸς ὡς ἔφυ τι ποικίλων  
καὶ ἡντιέκκαρτον. εἴ δέ πως ἀνασπρέψει  
ἐκεῖτος καὶ κεῖτος ἀναφέρων.



v. 753 In the general denunciation of sooth-  
saying (which possibly reveals a personal bias of  
the poet) a more direct communication with the  
gods is urged:-

τοῖσι θεοῖσι χρὴ  
θύντας αἰτεῖν ἀγαθὰ, μαντεῖας δ' ἔαν.  
vv. 754-60 The chorus agree:

τοὺς θεοὺς ἔχον τις ἂν  
φίλους ἀρίστην μαντικὴν ἔχει δόμοις.

v. 851 Menelaus uses the phrase

εἰ γὰρ εἰσιν οἱ θεοὶ σοφοί  
in the nature of an assumption.

v. 1075 Menelaus pleads confidence:

πτόρους γὰρ δαίμονες παύσουσί μου.

v. 1121 Helen has had the reputation of ac-  
compagnying Paris.

πομπᾶϊσιν Ἀφροδίτας.

v. 1148 The common flocking of her household



includes the lines

ἀδίκος πρόσθ' ἄμωτος ἄθεός.

v. 1150 But in comparison with human report, the chorus declare:

τὸ θεῶν ἔπος ἀλαθές κύρον.

Again we have exclamations from the religious sphere. Thus, θεὸν δέ σ' οὐ / ἐσθλῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀντιδωροποιάτο (v. 158), ὦ θεοί (vv. 72 and 555), ὦ θεός (v. 500), Ἄνδρες (v. 1204)

### Electra.

v. 67 Electra employs, for a strong expression of friendship, the following:-

ἐγὼ σ' ἴσον θεοῖσιν ἡγούμεν φίλον.

v. 190 At length, the chorus opens with ἀγέλα θεός.

And the advice which they give the princess is quite unattractive (vv. 193-197):-

Συκεῖς τοῖσι σοῖς δακρύοις





μή τι μῶσα θεούς, κρατή-  
σειν ἐχθρῶν ; οὗτοι στυγαχῆς,  
ἀλλ' εὐχαῖσι θεοὺς σεβί-  
ζουσ' ἔξεις εὐαμερίαν, ὦ παῖ.

v. 715 Euclyta, intending to inform the unknown  
Hephaestus that Eurydice still lives, assures her  
nominal husband:

ἡσθήσεταιί τοι καὶ προσεύξεται θεοῖς.

v. 782 The unknown prophesy destruction to  
Eurytemnestra in this fashion:

Τοιγάρ σέ ποτ' οὐρανίδαί  
πέψουσιν θανάτοις.

vv. 563 and 565 The old servant in the  
first joy of his semi-recognition of Eurydice:

ὦ πύτνε, εὔχου, ἔρχεαι Ἠλέκτρα, θεοῖς  
λαβεῖν φίλον θαυραρόν, ὃν φαίνει θεός.

v. 583 Eurydice says that he is confident of  
obtaining her revenge.



ἢ χρὴ μὴκέθ' ἡγεῖσθαι θεούς,  
εἰ τὰδ' ἴκ' ἔσται τῆς δίκης ὑπέρτερα.

The second contingency, it should be noted, does not arise.

v. 589 Then the chorus chant:

οὐδὲ θεὸς αὖ θεὸς  
ἀμετέρων τις ἄρει  
νίκαν,

and in the same strain (v. 593):-

ἴει λίτ' αὖ εἰς τοὺς θεούς.

v. 638 Orestes will be to Clytemnestra:

Πικρὸν γε συνβούλευτο, ἦν δὲς Ἄλφει.

vv. 671 and 672 Zeus Triton and Poseidon as well as Hera and Athena are formally invoked by Electra and Orestes to join and assist them in their deed.

v. 744 By the chorus:

φοβερὸν δὲ βροτοῖσι μέλλει



Κέρδος πρὸς θεῶν θεραπείας.

v. 775 Turning of the earth is described as  
νέπτερά βροντῇ Διός.

Of the further the sleep in part (v. 779).

v. 764 The messenger, reporting the success  
of Orestes, adds:-

ἄδδ' αὖ θεῶν εὐχεσθαι χρεών.

v. 890 Orestes on his victory:

θεὸς δὲν ἡγοῦ πρώτῃν, Ἡλέκτρα, τύχης  
ἀρχηγέτας τῶνδ' -----

v. 971 Here the situation must be considered.  
Orestes naturally hesitates to kill his mother:-

ὦ Φῶς, ποδδὲν γ' ἀντίαν ἐθεόπιδος.

But Electra encourages him (v. 972):

ἴπov δ' Ἀπόλλων σκαῖς ἦ, τίνας σοφοί;

So that his final decision is (v. 986):

καὶ θεῶν σπῆν γ', εἰ θεῶν δὲκεῖ τῆδε.

v. 1164 The chorus hear the death-cry of





Exclamations:-

νέμεε τοι δίκαν θεός.

As examples of exclamations may be cited  
ὦ Ζεῦ Ζεῦ (v. 137), ὦ θεοί (v. 771).

The atmosphere of this drama is certainly  
religious enough to render the appearance of  
the chorus not incongruous.

### Chorus

v. 72 Iolaus calls the treatment of the  
Theacrine Iών ἀγρία.

Similar (v. 77):

ὅς, ὦ ξένε, με σοὺς ἀγμάδας θεοῦ  
ἔλκει.

And he requests (v. 97) not to be sent to  
ἀγὼς πρὸς βίαν θεῶν.

The chorus reply (v. 101 ff.):—

εἰκὸς θεῶν ἱκτῆρας αἰδεῖσθαι, βέη.



καὶ μὴ βιαίῳ χειρὶ δαιμόνων  
ἀποδεικτεῖν ἔδην,  
and assert (v. 107) :-

ἄθεον ἰκεσίαν μεθεῖναι.

v. 258 Demophon to Cyrene :-

σκαῖος πέφυκας τοῦ θεοῦ πλείω φρονῶν,  
and (260) :-

ἅπασι κοῖνον ῥῆμα δαιμόνων ἔδρα.

v. 347 Iolaus relies on the gods :-

θεοῖσι δ' οὐ κακίοισι

χρῶμεθα συμάχεσθιν Ἀργείων, ἄναξ.

Iolaus relies on the Argives, but Pallas stands  
for them, and she will not submit to be conquered.

v. 388 Iolaus again :-

ὁ Ζεὺς κοδυστὰς τῶν ἄγαν ὑπερβίων.

v. 516 Melanippe in her funeral speech :-

κἂν ἀπαλλαγὴν πότων

καὶ νόστιος ὑαῖν εὖρεθῇ ποτ' ἐκ θεῶν.



vv. 608-9 The sentiments of the chorus are:-

οὐτινὰ φημι θεῶν ἰστέον ἄβυσσον οὐ βαρύνουσιν  
ἄνδρα γενέσθαι

v. 717 Polaus, departing for battle, tries to  
calm Alcmena:-

καὶ Ζηνὶ τῶν σῶν, οἷός' ἐγώ, μέλει πόνων.

v. 718 The *anapaest*, it must be remembered, is  
due to her previous position; and, as a matter  
of fact, her fears are later happily disappointed.

vv. 766-69 The triumphant psalm of the  
chorus runs:-

Ζεὺς μοι σύμμαχος, οὐ φοβέσθαι  
Ζεὺς μοι χάριν ἐνδίκως  
ἔχει· οὐποτε θνατῶν  
ἥσσοις θεοὶ ----- φανοῦνται.

v. 784 Polaus is mentioned as

πράξας δ' ἐκ θεῶν κάλλιστα δῆ.

v. 864 Another striking instance (cf. Andromache)





1218) here occurs in which a person who mistrusts the gods is shown to be in the wrong. Athena herself acknowledges her former (v. 718) error:-

ὦ Ζεῦ, χάριν μὲν τῶν' ἐπεσπέψω κακά,  
χάριν δ' ὅσως σοι τῶν πεπραγμένων ἔχω.  
καὶ πάντας τὸν ἑαὶν πρόθεν οὐ δοκούσ' ἐγὼ  
θεοῖς ὀμδεῖν νῦν ἐπίσταμαι σαφῶς.

C And just beyond the water (v. 877):

καὶ θεοῖς πατρώοις θύεσθ'.

vv. 902-3 The words of the chorus as to the city:-

οὐ χρὴν τόδε ποτ' ἀφελέσθαι,  
τιμῶν θεοῦς.

v. 909 The captive Eurystheus affirms the divinity of Hera (Hei's παρ' ἐν), and adds:

Ἥρα με κάμνειν τάνδ' ἔθηκεν ἰὼν νόσον

vv. 1012-13. His treatment by the state



πόδες τ' ἀφᾶνε σαρφονότα, τὸν θεὸν  
μεῖζον τίοντα τᾶς ἐμᾶς ἔχθρας --

V. 1037-8 Te finds, indeed, that his confidence in Hera has been misplaced; but on the other hand the fault is his own, for he should have heeded the oracle.

πῶς οὖν ταῦτ' ἐνὶ πεπνυμένῳ  
δεῦρ' ἦλθεν, ἀλλ' οὐ χραισὺν ἰδύμεν θεοῦ;  
For exclamations cf. ὦ Ζεῦ τροπαῖε (v. 861)  
by the chorus, ὦ Ζεῦ (v. 864) by Cassandra.

### Teracles Furios.

v. 62. Megara though adverse circumstances cries out:--

ὥς οὐδὲν ἀνθρώποισι τῶν θεῶν σαφές.

Notice, however, that her fears are later shown to be barren. Teracles returns.

v. 110. To a stirring reference to Zeus male



by Zeus Amphitryon responds:-

τὸ τοῦ Διὸς κεν Ζεὺς ἀνυρέω \*\*\*  
παῖδός.

He must defend Heracles, he says, οὐν  
καρτέρει θεοῖς (v. 176); the hero won his  
battles, moreover, by the gods' help (μετὰ  
θεῶν), v. 180.

v. 212 Amphitryon proceeds to say that  
instead of his dying by Zeus's hand, the  
reverse should take place,

εἰ Ζεὺς Σικαίᾳς εἶχεν εἰς ἡμᾶς ὀφέναι.

But this condition is practically fulfilled  
by the return of Heracles.

Similarly, the doubt (v. 339)

ὦ Ζεῦ, μάτην ἄρ' ἠυόραυόν σ' ἐκτεταύην  
is happily proved idle.

vv. 341-7 The whole selection which follows  
indicates the growing skepticism of a man





under the power of misfortune:-

οὐ [sc. Ζεὺς] δ' ἦν ἄρ' ἥσεν ἢ δοκεῖς εἶναι φίλος  
ἀρετῇ σε νικῶ ἄνατ' ὧν θεὸν μέγαν  
παῖδας γὰρ οὐ προύδωκα τοῖς Ἑλλήεσσιν  
οὐ δ' εἰς μὲν εὐνὰς κρύφιος ἠπίστω μολεῖν,  
τ' ἀλλότρια δέκτρα δόντας οὐδ' ἐνὸς λαβών,  
σώζειν δὲ τοὺς σοὺς οὐκ ἐπίστασαι φίλους,  
ἀμαθὴς τις εἴ θεός, εἰ δέκαλος οὐκ ἔφους.

It, strange to say! considering Verrill's theory, this abuse is shown by the subsequent course of the action to be utterly unjustified. Zeus is neither ignorant nor unjust; Hercules saves Eurytus, rescues his offspring; the victory is so complete that the previous doubt in *Mezura* upon the children (vv. 521-2):-

ἴτ', ἐγκονεῖτε, μὴ μέθ' αὖτ', ἐπεὶ Διὸς  
σωτήρ' οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅτ' ὕστερος.

Zeus is therefore fully entitled as "preserver."



v. 655 The chorus suggest what would be a novel scheme for distinguishing the god and the hero,

εἰ δὲ θεοῖς ἦν ξύνεσις καὶ σοφία κατ' ἄνδρας  
but surely conclude (vv. 664-70)

νῦν δ' οὐδεὶς ὄψος εἰ θεῶν

χρᾶσθαι τοῖς οὐδὲ κακοῖς σαφές.

v. 719 Lycus maintains that Heracles never will come back; Amphitryon answers:-

οὐκ, εἴγε μὴ τις θεῶν ἀναστήσειέ κεν

vv. 757-9 The chorus on the death of the Lycus:-

τίς ὁ θεοῦς ἀνομία χραίνων, θνατὸς ὢν,  
ἄφρονα λόγον οὐρανόων μακάρων κατέβαλ',  
ὥς ἄρ' οὐ σθένουσιν θεοί;

And again (v. 772):-

θεοὶ θεοὶ τῶν ἀδίκων  
μέλουσι καὶ τῶν ὀσίων ἐπάειν.

v. 841 The heavenly messenger then states



why Heracles must suffer:-

ἢ θεὸς μὲν οὐδανοῦ

τὰ θνητὰ δ' ἔσται μέγα, μὴ δότος δίκην.

v. 1002-6 The guilting of Heracles in his madness is accomplished, according to the messenger, almost by a deus ex machina:

ἀλλ' ἦλθεν εἰκὼν ὡς ὄρν' ἐφαίνετο

Παλλὰς κραδαίνουσα, ἔγχος ἐπὶ λόφῳ κέαρ,

κόρυμβον πέτρῳ στέρνον εἰς Ἑρακλίδους,

φ' οὐκ ἔχοντος ἀποχῶντ' ἐπέσχε κείσ' ὕπνον

καθῆκε.

v. 1115 *anaphora*, to gauge the enormity of the wild slaughter performed by Heracles, was the expression:

ἂ καὶ θεῶν τις, εἰ πάθος, καταστένοι.

v. 1127 *anaphora* apostrophizes Zeus:-

ὦ Ζεῦ, παρ' Ἑρῆς ἅρ' ὄρν' ἄρ' ἔστιν τόδε;

v. 1135 When Heracles, however struck, asks





who murdered his children, the answer is:

οὐ καὶ τὰ τόξα καὶ θεῶν ὅς αἴτιος.

vv. 1227-8 Theseus declares:

ὅς τις εὐγενὴς βροτῶν  
φέρει τὰ θεῶν γε πτώματ', οὐδ' ἀναίνετα.

v. 1232 Theseus enquires why Theseus  
uncovers his head to the sun. The other  
replies:

τί δ'; οὐ μαίνας ἄνθρως ὢν τὰ τῶν θεῶν.

Wilamowitz (Heracles<sup>2</sup> II, p. 250), in a  
long note, explains τὰ τῶν θεῶν as meaning  
"the cements". But even so, the exact phrasing  
is noteworthy, and it may be said that W.'s  
translation

"Warum nicht? ewig ist das Element:

du bist ein mensch und <sup>Flonisch</sup> Kometes nicht

produces in the mind a rather different  
impression from the Greek



v. 1242. Theseus:-

δυνεὶς ἀποιδῶν δῶν μέλει τι ταῖσιν;

v. 1243. Theseus:

αὐτὰρ ὁ θεός, πρὸς δὲ τοὺς θεοὺς ἐγώ.

There is characterization once more. The overpowering grief of the hero accounts for this rash utterance, for which he is immediately rebuked by Theseus.

v. 1253. So also here. Theseus says, that his good deeds avail him naught, ἀλλ' Ἥρα κτερεῖ. His sufferings have made him hostile to the gods: hence his statements

Zeὺς δ' ὅστις ὁ Zeὺς ποδέρχον μ' ἐγείνατο  
Ἥρα (v. 1263).

οὐ πατέρα γὰρ ἀντὶ Zeνὸς ἡγοῦμαι σ' ἐγώ (v. 1265).

Of Hera he says further (vv. 1301-8):-

τοιαύτη θεῶ



τίς ἂν προσεύχοιτο;

But the implication is one of contempt, not of disbelief. He recognizes that she has "turned upside down" the foremost man in Greece, and has "accomplished her wish."

Most interesting at this point is the explanation of *Chances*. It *strikes* alone, but the gods as well, who have caused his woes, are subject to "chances" (*ταῖς τύχαις*). No being, inferior or superior, then, is absolutely secure. Whence he concludes (vv. 1320-21):

ἡμεῖς τε φάσμεν, εἰ οὐ κὲν Ἄνθρωπος γένηται  
φάρμακον ὑπερφρονέει τὰς τύχας, ἅεν δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς.

v. 1340, ff. With regard to this fine declamation of the note of *Williamowitz* (*Tragicus* II, p. 272). "The passage paraphrases verses of Xenophanes," he says. Here again, however, I must repeat that for the immediate purposes





of the action no account need be taken of  
 Xenophanes and the philosophers. What has  
 Pericles, a mystical hero, properly to do  
 with Xenophanes? The sentiments as  
represented are simply the working out of  
 the character's cogitations. He does not say:  
 "Such and such are my notions of Godhead;  
 they do not correspond with the common  
 religion of the age of Pericles; therefore the  
 latter system is all false." He merely  
 maintains: "I believe there are gods, but  
 that what gods there are are good." His  
 belief in gods at all is the only matter on  
 which I desire to be emphatic, because that  
 single fact, once granted, tends to justify  
 the deus ex machina from an artistic  
 standpoint.



### Supplices.

v. 157 *Theseus* to *Athraustes*, on the expedition against *Thebes*:-

οὐκ ἤλθες, ὡς ἔοικεν, εὐνυσία θεῶν

And again (v. 159):

οὕτω το θεῶν παίδας ἀπεσιγάς;

v. 175 ff. *Theseus* is represented as a pious believer in the gods, and certainly seems to come off none the worse for it.

--- *Ρεῖν* (vv. 201-2) is assigned as the cause of all blessing to mankind.

The chief offence of *Athraustes* he regards (vv. 230-31) as

ἀτιμάσας βία παρὰ θεῶν θεούς.

v. 262 *Athraustes* calls the divine powers to witness:

ὡς οὐδὲν ἡμῶν ἔφρεσαν δεινὰ θεῶν.

Later, nevertheless, the accusation proves



to have been unfounded.

vv. 301-2 Athena, urging the men to defend the suppliants:-

ἐγὼ δέ σ', ὦ παῖ, πρῶτα μὲν τὰ τῶν θεῶν  
σκοπεῖν κεδεύω ἢ πρᾶλῆς ἀτιμάσας.

vv. 448-9 Theseus was miserably un-  
done, although

προσβαλὼν πόλαισιν ὤκισεν πόλιν  
τέρπειν θεῶν θέλοντας ἵνα τε ποῖν θέλῃ.

vv. 504-5 The Theban Herald to Theseus:

ἢ νῦν φρονεῖν ἄμεινον ἐξαύχει Διός,  
ἢ θεὸς δικάϊως τοὺς κακοὺς ἀπολλύει.

v. 511 The chorus reply, in part:

ἐξαρκέσας ἦν Ζεὺς ὁ τιμωρούμενος.

vv. 544-7. The pity of Theseus is  
again expressed. He desires the aid of the  
gods that love justice, without whom no  
mortal bravery can succeed. Above that





*Theeues does Triumph.*

v. 612 ff. The supremacy of the gods is insisted on by the semi-chorus.

vv. 639-70 Another reference to Kapaneus, this time by the messenger:-

Καπανεὺς γὰρ ἦν ἄνθρωπος,  
ὃν Ζεὺς περὶ πυρρῶν καταβέβηκε.

v. 732 The chorus, after the victory, declare  
νῦν ----- θεοὺς νομίζω.

v. 734 Alceus goes much further:-

ὦ Ζεῦ, τί ἴστα τοὺς ταλαειώτους βροτοὺς  
σπεῖν λεγόντι; σὺ γὰρ ἐξηρτήμεθα  
δρῶντες τε τοιαῦτα ἐν οὐ τυχάνης δέδωκε.

Perhaps the last passages are instances of characterization in the opposite direction from cases already noted, - i. e. excessive devotion caused by excessive joy, - but a general belief seems still the habitual



attitude of the characters.

vv. 1177-5 Theseus to characters, at parting:

Ζεὺς δὲ θυρίσσωρ οἱ τ' ἐν οὐρανῷ θεοὶ  
 ἴων ὑψ' ἡμῶν στείχεται ἡδυνάμενοι.

v. 1220 Athena predicts the success of  
 the Epigoni:-

Ἰππὸν στρατεύεσθαι οὐν θεῶν πορεύσεται.

vv. 1227 ff. Theseus acknowledges his  
 entire dependence on Athena.

For an abrupt exclamation, cf. ἰὼ Ζεῦ  
 (v. 628).

### Hippolytus.

vv. 5-8 Significant are the words of Aphrodite:-

τοὺς μὲν σεβόμενος ταῦτ' ἀπλοβέω κρείττω,  
 σφάλλω δ' ὅσα σφραγίσσιν εἰς ἡμᾶς ἀέθρα.  
 ἐνέσθῃ γὰρ δὲ κ' ἂν θεῶν γένει τάδε,  
 πυνυμένοι χαίρουσιν ἀνθρώπων ὕπνῳ.



v. 88 Views of the servants:-

ἀναβ, θεὸς γὰρ ἰερὸς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἡμεῖς.

v. 107 Further curious is the theology of Hippolytus:

ἔδδοκεν ἄλλος θεὸς τε καὶ ἡμεῖς ἡμεῖς.

v. 113 Hippolytus disavows being, but the course of the drama shows his action, from a worldly point of view, unwise.

τὴν δὲ καὶ ἡμεῖς καὶ ἡμεῖς καὶ ἡμεῖς.

v. 120 οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμεῖς καὶ ἡμεῖς καὶ ἡμεῖς.

There is considerable justice in the usual appeal to Athena not to listen to the contemptuous words of Hippolytus. But her standpoint is a different one: she demands homage from all alike (v. 5). The goddess Hippolytus not so much for his insult as for his studied neglect.

v. 237 The name is speaking of Phaedra's further -





ὅστις σε θεῶν ἡνασειράζει

καὶ παρακόπτει φρένας, ὦ παῖ.

v. 738 *could now she has become what god it is:*

ὑγραὶ δ' εἰς σ' ἐπέσκηψαν θεᾶς.

v. 443 The same servant clearly refers to love in the abstract, - the passion of love, - but notice how persistently she sticks to the personification:

Κύπρις γὰρ οὐ φερντός, ἢν ἠαδδῆν ῥυῆ.

cf. vv. 399-400, where Phaedra declares

οὐκ ἐξήνυτον Κύπριν κρατῆσαι.

v. 474 The characterization lies, to be sure, ~~plain~~ a certain part here. The nurse is trying hard to persuade, by means fair or foul; but at once into she uses arguments that she thinks will be credible:

οὐ γὰρ ἄλλο πλὴν ὕβρις

τάδ' ἐστὶ, κρείσσω δαιμόνων εἶναι θέλει.

τόλμα δ' ἐρῶσα θεῶν ἐφελθόντα τόλμα.



v. 885 ff. Hippolytus, explaining Theseus, in his attempt upon Phaedra wrought outrage,

Τὸ δεινὸν Ζεὺς ὅμῳ ἀτιμάσας.

Immediately comes a passage which shows quite convincingly that Euripides treated the gods in his dramas as gods. Theseus requests of his father Poseidon the fulfillment of one out of three potentia curses. Hippolytus is to perish: and the curse actually takes effect. It is all an integral part of the action. Does Poseidon make us laugh by his "crude arbitrary" response to Theseus's prayer? Is the death of Hippolytus absurd and impossible? It is rather most artistic, and full of true pathos.

Another fact, is that an outside force, not altogether alien to a bus ex machina, though summoned by Theseus, here interrupts the development of the action. The character of the



in the supremacy of the gods; a god is *prayed* to intervene; he *does* intervene, and *thereby* brings about the conclusion of the piece. Unless you take the divine power of Prouton for granted, the whole fabric comes to naught. For, if the monster from the waves is a mere chance recurrence, responsibility for his son's death falls from Theseus, the closing scene with the forgiveness of Hippolytus has no meaning, and the play loses all its tragic value.

v. 1037. Hippolytus (and the chorus) has furnished sufficient reputation

ἵππολυτος παρὰ σὺν, τίς τιν' οὐ θαυμάσιον, θεῶν.

v. 1103 The chorus speak of

τὰ θεῶν μελεδύμαθ'.

and at v. 1146 sing; αὐτίω θεῶσιν.

v. 1339 ff. Artemis defends the general attitude of the gods:





τοὺς γὰρ εὐσεβεῖς θεοὶ  
ἀνίσκοντας οὐ χαίρουσι· τοὺς γέ μιν κακοὺς  
αὐτοῖς τέκνοι καὶ δόμοις ἐξόδλυμεν.

v. 1346 The chorus mention πένθος θεῶν, which  
is true in a double sense; Cyprus and Iasion  
have each slain a victim.

v. 1363 Hippolytus cries to heaven

Ζεῦ Ζεῦ τάδ' ὑπᾶς;

The chorus claims that his grief has met no  
recompense, but possibly this is not quite just,  
since he has, the goddesses to console him in his  
sorrowful moments, is promised a speedy revenge,  
and is told of a solemn rite to be inaugurated  
in his memory.

In general, the responsibility for Hippolytus's  
death is fixed upon Cyprus, and the two girls  
so free from blame (cf. v. 1400 ff.); indeed, ac-  
cording to v. 1328 ff., it was not allowable for them



To see obstructive measures, but they are wise and  
the hindrance of them is, however (rightly or  
wrongly), ascribed to heaven; cf. v. 1400,

ἐξ ἁπατάων δαίμονος βουλεύματα,  
and v. 1714:

δίδως γὰρ ἦμεν πρὸς θεῶν ἐσφαλμέναι.

v. 1733-4 Artemis partially explains man's  
proneness to error:

ἄνθρωποι δὲ

θεῶν διδόντων εἰκὸς ἐξαμαρτάνειν.

For explanation, cf. πρὸς θεῶν (vv. 311, 333, 503,  
581), ὡς θεὸς Πόσειδόν θ' (v. 1167).

Hyginia Chalcidensis.

Vv. 24-5 Agamemnon is clearing sources  
of danger to rulers:-

τότε μὲν τὰ θεῶν οὐκ ὀρθωθέντι  
ἀνέτρεψε βίον κτε



v. 33 The old man declares:-

Κὰν μὲν οὐ Αἴδης  
τὰ θεῶν οὕτω βουλόμεν' ἔσται.

v. 411 Agamemnon, to Menelaus:

Ἑλλὰς δὲ σὺν σοὶ κατὰ θεὸν νοοεῖ τινα.

v. 546 The chorus, chorus of Iphigenia, sing:

θεοὶ τοὶ κρείστους οἳ τ' ὀλβοφόροι  
τοῖς οὐκ εὐδαίμοσι Ἀνατῶν.

v. 702 The gods of Agamemnon's and Clytemnestra's conversation are quite the gods of epic poetry:

ΑΓ. ὦ Πάρις ἴ' ἔσχε Νηρῶς κῆρυξ  
ΚΛ. θεοῦ δίδοντας, ἢ βία θεῶν λαβεῖν;

v. 746 ff. Agamemnon, speaks:

οὐν Κάλχαντι τῷ θυμπύλῳ  
κοινῇ τὸ τῆς θεοῦ φῖλον ----  
ἐξιστορήσω εἴ τι

v. 808-9 Achilles is slow, stolid in his





expression :-

οὕτω δεινὸς ἐμπίπτωκ' ἔρως  
τῆσδε στρατείας Ἑλλάδ' οὐκ ἄνευ θεῶν.

vr. 973-4 *Similes when he appears with to*  
*Telemachos :-*

θεὸς ἐγὼ πέφνά σοι  
μείστος, οὐκ ὢν ἄλλ' ὅπως γενήσομαι.

vr. 1016-7 *cite again the words of the chorus:*

καὶ μὴ κοινὸς ἀγῶν βροτοῖς  
μή τις θεῶν φθόνος ἔλθῃ.

vr. 1187-90 *Telemachos in his appeal to*  
*Agamemnon :-*

ἦ τέρ' ἀσυνέτους τοὺς θεοὺς ἤρῳμεθ' ἄν,  
εἰ τοῖσιν αὐθένταισιν εὖ φρονήσομεν.<sup>1</sup>

v. 1346 "ὦ Ἄρτεμις," says Telemachos, "requires  
my body for sacrifice,

ἐμπαδὼν γενήσομαι γὰρ Ἀνὰς οὗτα τῇ θεῷ;

[v. 1610 *The messenger in conclusion:*

1. For the obverse side of the picture, see vr. 1034-5.



ἀπὸς δόξατα δὲ βροτῶν τὰ τῶν θεῶν.

[But the authenticity of the passage is dubious]

### Iphigeneia Taurica

Inasmuch as the Tauric Iphigeneia is one of the dramas which Verrall treats exhaustively, and in which he bases his arguments, I shall adopt the method of answering his chief objections, since he admits (pp. 175, 217) that the characters are sincere enough in their belief. References are by pages, to his book.

P. 166 Verrall is finical about the closing words of Othone. The lines in Shack's edition give very good sense! In v. 1771 V. adopts a variant reading (εἰς ταῦτ' ἔσ' <sup>2</sup>) which cannot be of serious importance, as Shack in his Adventitious Edition passes it over. These are the verses.

1. Excepting perhaps δικάτας εἰς ἐκ', the necessity, which is regularly accounted for on the ground of a preceding λέωνος.
2. To the MSS. — But Mauleand's εἴτα τόδε has been generally accepted.



τάσδε δ' ἐκπέμπειν χθονὸς

Ἑλληνίδας γυναῖκας ἐξεφίεμαι

γυνῆς δικαίᾳς εἶνεκ'· ἐξέσωσα δὲ

1470 καὶ πρὶν τ' Ἀρείοις ἐν πάχῃ ψήφους ἴσας  
κρίνω, Ὀρέων· καὶ νόμισα' ἔσται τόδε,  
νικῶν ἰσχυρεῖς ὅστις ἂν ψήφους λάβῃ.

ἄλλ' ἐκκαίβου τὴν κασιγνήταν, χθονός,

Ἀρακύνονος παῖ, καὶ σὺ μὲν θυμῷ, τῆρας

νόμισμα is then clear enough, and is quite  
consistent with a common practice of the dei  
ex machina in establishing customs. The  
inaccuracy of v. 1470, to which objection is made,  
will be done away with, by a study of the  
structure of the speech (cf. p. 1820 of this paper).  
The order of address is symmetrical, — *Thous,*  
*Teuter, Iphigenia, Teuter, Thous.* The command  
concerning the Grecian captives (Ἑλληνίδας γυναῖ-  
κας) is evidently thrown in by the way and





suggested to the mind by the mention of *Yovaines* *Yovx, ppeis* (v. 1446); the goddess then immediately proceeds to her second series of injunctions to *Orestes*.

P. 171 The weight attached to the plural *παῖδες ἐν Ἀπείρῳ* seems ~~unwise~~, considering the general artificiality and many turns of tragic fiction.

P. 174 Too much is again made of a small point. True, in the matter of the identification of the two youths (v. 262 ff) a triumph was won by the *κῆρυξ*'s *ῥῆς*, but not (as Terrall says) because "the notion of gods appearing in human form seemed laughable" to him; it was simply that this fellow saw no marks of divinity about the strangers, for other reason for thinking them *κῆρυξ*. The thing to him "laughable" was the *εἶδος* (v. 276)



of his mate under the circumstances; but he gives no hint that a real theophany would be incredible to him.

P. 177 *Surprise* is expressed at the version of *Empedocles* that some of the *Titans* still followed *Trentes*. But it should be recalled that these *Empires*, governing as they do the violations of natural laws, are a subtler conception than the anthropomorphic god. They stand in a category similar to the *Mjölnir* and *Névéris*, and are not inevitably subject to the control of the *trick* (*deceptions*)! Certain of them had not yielded to the power of the *conit*, yet might be moved by other influences; the image of *Artemis* belongs rather to the *charm* sphere. *Empire* in *Emre* might ward off these spirits.

P. 178 In regard to the dream, the *trick*

1. Cf. *esch. Em.* 848-49 and 930-31.



interpretation seems to be that it makes the best of Iphigenia on this occasion by want to her old home, and subsequently (when she learns that the new comers are from Argos) long to send a message thither. Thus it contributes to the working of the play. — v. 348 ff. represent more of a passing whim than Vernal sees in them.

§ 179. vv. 570-71 ff.

οὐδ' οἱ σοφοί τε δαίμονες κεκλημένοι  
πτηνῶν ὄνείρων εἰσὶν ἄψευδέστεροι κτῆ.

The situation which calls forth this reflection from Iphigenia is not a permanent one! The right-minded spectator must remember the maxim: "Observe the end." The remark is too far overemphasized by Vernal.

§ 182 too much is made of κλῆιν (v. 1476).  
Then state the general principle

ἄρα σ' Ἀθήνα, τοῖσι τῶν θεῶν λόγους

1. The same statement holds good for vv. 711-15.





ὅστις κλέων ἀπὸ τοῦ, οὐκ ὀρθῶς φησὶν,  
and then (ἐπὶ δ') cites himself as an individual  
example under that heading. Cf. also τὸν κλέωνα  
(1410).

§ 183 That the Erinyes were invisible  
to the human eye, and that events showed  
signs of temporary insanity does not render  
the inclusion of the corpses out of the  
question. The essential effect produced by the  
spirits may be conceived as madness. Eur-  
ipides perhaps shows less credit than Aeschylus  
in not attempting to give them a bodily  
presence. Orestes is not less sure that he  
is being pursued by the Furies when he is in  
his right mind.

§ 184 The use of κλέων may conceivably  
be a fancy of tragic diction for "hand," as  
χεῖρ is so often employed for "arm"; or the



two words Πάλλας ὠλέων may mean merely  
"by the arm of Pallas" (in casting a vote).

P. 112 To the assertion that Iphigenia in  
her recital of the scene at Aulis is silent on  
certain points because of her consciousness of  
the point, it may be said that both v. 360,

ἔσθ' ἄρα βούλει δαυλίδαι, ἱερὰ ὧς δ' ἦν ὁ γενναῖος ἀνὴρ  
and αἰεταπὶν γάμον (v. 371) are just the strong  
terms for something that never took place!

P. 114 It is hardly worth while to raise a  
moral point when the scene is so painful. To  
the average Greek Canning was plain-speech; he  
was proud of his ability therein, and delighted  
in his superiority over the stupid barbarian.  
— v. 1205, πιστὸν Ἑλλὰς οἶδεν οἶδεν has no  
great tinge of bitterness, but is spoken to and  
the King to think that Iphigenia is the worthy  
sister in his behalf.



P. 146 The conspiracy, to be discussed here long (p. 234 ff.), happens with some regularity in Euripides.

P. 157 The "superhuman powers" do serve as a motivation for the super machine, as Schuster pointed out. But our inference need not be the same as Verrall's!

P. 159 The argumentation here seems strikingly far-fetched, namely, by his grand rationalizing, practically avoids his friend's question. What he says about the tragedian's personal opinions may all be true. But his explanation of the gods appears equally well to cover dramatic character. Hence Verrall has no right, in telling Sumner as a guide, to maintain still "when an actor comes on as *Ion* or *Alceste*, we must, of course, to follow Euripides's sense, ignore the fact that he is *Plato's* *Ion*."





The quotation from Lucian *Tragica*, gives too much.

P. 202-3 Of the three dubious passages upon which Tennant insists, v. 1026 would fall out, if at all, because of its incoherence and aphoristic ring: in v. 1026 *Q'ovov* does not suit well the tone of the conversation, nor does *Epigramia* attract any attention; the words of deception, not of fighting, are being brought out: in v. 1025 the sentence reads perfectly well by amending *Etavva* to *'av n'vra* (Nauck's text).

P. 204 Compare the latter part of my comment on p. 177.

### Ton.

The Ton, likewise, forms a chapter in Tennant's work.



¶ 135 We may very properly take note of  
the word ἡδίστον in v. 1557,

ὅς ἐστι μέν ὕμιν σφῶν ἡδεῖν οὐκ ἡδίστον,  
he "thought it not seemly to come into your  
midst." It is likely that Apollo did not  
come forward because he wished no unpleas-  
ure (i.e. in regard) would be shown, even at the start,  
regarding a state of affairs which is soon  
found to be thoroughly acceptable.

¶ 136 ff. - Apollo alters his plan (v. 1563  
ff.) with the progress of events. It does not  
appear that it would have been absolutely  
impossible for him to carry out his original  
purpose. The night had been conspired with  
Cerberus's explanation; and, as it is, the con-  
fusion which arises in his soul is prob-  
ably instigated by the god. This change of mind  
is not entirely inconsistent with knowledge



of the future. For instance, a scholar obtained of the Mōipai for Cicero (Vol. I, 91) that the capture of Loris should not occur until three years after the date originally set. That is, the Mōipai, on request, changed their minds. Yet surely the Mōipai knew something of the future.

¶ 144 Does not the Greek, in this place, attribute some of his own natural cunning to Cicero? Among the Greek's deception, especially for a good end, involves no dishonor. Hector is but the victim of a harmless — from the Greek standpoint — hoax. Since Hector is hereafter to be his son to all intents and purposes, a belief in the reality of the kinship will help matters. (Homer, Iliad v. 1001) Andante commends the deat.

¶ 151 ff. The interpretation of the





recognition scene is unnecessarily postponed.  
 Apollo, by the mouth of Athena, confirms the  
 suggestion that it all took place by his  
 direction (αἰχμαυτὸς ἐπ' ὀφθαλμοῖς, v. 1565).

The references from this point are to  
 verses of the play in hand.

v. 28 There is a certain pleasing symmetry  
 in the way that Apollo delegates other  
 gods to represent him in both prologue and  
 epilogue. Hermes brings the child to Delphi:  
 Athena corroborates the account of his origin.  
 He is himself is continually in the back-  
 ground, the unseen guide.

vv. 252-4 To this censure uttered by  
 Athena respond her later recantations ἐπε-  
 γετῶν τε (v. 1546), ὡφελῶν τε (v. 1545), and  
 vv. 1612-13.



v. 341 In regard to Ton's doubt of the story of Teusa's friend, it may be said that a careless tale, repeated at second-hand always loses credence.

v. 355 ἀδικεῖν νῦν ὁ θεὸς is spoken on the assumption that the child was left to die. Ton in the next line suggests an alternative, which is the real one. Teusa's estimate of it (v. 357) does not include any future restoration of the child, and hence is not in conflict with her sentiments at the end of the play.

v. 370 κακὸς (Garcís) in this line refers to Apollo's rape (as Virall takes it) than to his supposed subsequent neglect.

vv. 376-80 ἂν γὰρ βίη πτεύμεν ἐκόντες βῶν,  
ἀνύνητα κεκτήμεσθα τὰράθ' ὥ γόναι.  
ἂ δ' ἂν διδῶσ' ἐκόντες, ὥφελούμεθα.



The principle here stated is rather strikingly confirmed by Athena's haste (v. 1536) to anticipate the question which Ten proposes to put to Loxias.

v. 386 Teusa's principal approach is afterwards discovered.

v. 437 ff. Teusa puts the weight of Ten's complaint upon βία γαῖν. As a matter of fact, πρὸ δίδωσι and ἀνέκτεῖ are the emphatic words. The charges so implicit being untrue, the deduction (v. 472 ff.) falls to the ground.

Notice the personification of Love as Κούρις (v. 847), Ἀφροδίτη (v. 1103).

v. 1117 The account, at least, gives the full credit for frustrating an unjust plan.

v. 1312 It scarcely need be said that Ten's remarks are not to the purpose, arising





they do from a mistaken idea of the situation.

v. 1385 Terrell conveys the impression (p. 155 and elsewhere) that Tom loses faith with the advance of the play. This theory is not wholly borne out. In the present verse he still feels regard and gratitude towards the god. Even at v. 1547 there is no serious objection to his asking a question in his disturbed frame of mind, especially as he avows later (v. 1608) that he once wanted to make assurance doubly sure. For the crisis in v. 1547 is not the same as the hypothesis at v. 370: that Phokos practised deceit, with good intention, on Xanthos would not make him to a Greek mind kakos.

v. 1402 There, too, Tom thinks some god is his ally in inspiring Creusa to leave the altar.

v. 1456 And he is perfectly ready to attribute his preservation to a god ('θεῶν τόδ').



v. 1595 Compare my remarks on Bacchae  
1180-81. Athena's stated opinion, καὶ δὲ τ' Ἀνὸ δὲ  
πᾶν τ' ἴπρ' αἴε, succeeded by proof, -print for  
-print, is naturally calculated to produce a  
considerable impression.

vv. 1614-15 The divine comment on an earthly  
story, couched in the form of a proverbial truth,  
can scarcely escape the function of pointing a  
moral to the incidents that have gone before.

v. 1620 And the chorus echo the saying of the  
goddess. Apparently the traditional religion has  
been adapted by Apollo's change of procedure (in spite of  
Verrill, p. 136, paragraph 1).

### Cyclops

v. 285 Odysseus on the expedition to Troy:

θεοὺ τὸ πρᾶγμα· ἡ δὲ δὲν αἰτῶν βοῶν

v. 316 The Cyclops's notions are rather



materialist:

ὁ δ' αὖτος, ἀνθρωπίσθη, τοῖς σαφοῖς θεοῖς,

He feels quite equal to Zeus (v. 321), for whom he cares little (v. 320). He sacrifices to himself, not to the gods (v. 330), as he has some right to do, possessing the largest portion of all deities (v. 335). Finally he rationalises Zeus in a beautiful manner (vv. 336-8):-

ὥς τοῦμπιεῖν γε καὶ φαγεῖν τοῦφ' ἡμέραν  
Ζεὺς οὗτος ἀνθρώποισι τοῖσι σώφροσι,  
λυπεῖν δὲ μηδὲν αὐτόν.

And to all lingering caeli colae he says  
κλαίειν ἄνωγα (v. 340).

At length, the Cyclops approaches the measure of what should be the Euripidean hero, on the lines laid down by Tennyson. Yet he seems to grow more the better for his advanced views.

v. 350 Odysseus, on the other hand, is true





to his ancestral religion:-

ὦ Πάδδ' ἄ, ὦ Λέπποινα Διγενέει θυγάτηρ,

νῦν νῦν ἄρπυξον

and Ζεῦ Ζέε', ὅρα τὰδ'.

(to the Cyclops) εἰ γὰρ αὐτὰ καὶ Βιένεις,

ἄδδω νομίζεαι Ζεὺς, τὸ κατὰ δὲν, θεὸς

v. 411 Odysseus describes the conception of his  
idea to circumvent Polyphemus:-

εἰς ἡν ἄθε' μοι τι θεῖον.

v. 521 At this point Odysseus and the  
Cyclops play with the anthropomorphic term  
for wine:-

ΚΥ. ὁ Βάκχος δὲ τίς θεὸς νομίζεαι;

(v. 525) θεὸς δ' ἐν ἀσπίδι πῶς γένηθ' οἴκους ἔχει;

(v. 527) οὐ τοὺς θεὸς χοῖν' οἶνον ἔχει ἐν στήθεσιν;

vv. 577-80 Strange visions from an abused  
Odysseus haunt the intoxicated Cyclops:-

τοῦ Διὸς τε τοῦ Ἑρμῆος



λεύσω τὸ πᾶν τε δακνόνων ἰγνὼν πέρας.

vv. 588-600 C. & G. in Odysseus couples his prayer to Fire in anthropomorphic phrase:-

Ἥραιστ' ἀνάξ Αἰνείη, γείτονος κακοῦ

δακνόν πυρώσας ἴμ' ἀπαλλύεσθ' ἅπαξ.

v. 605 Just before he describes the Cyclops as one

ὧ θεῶν οὐδὲν ἢ βροτῶν μέλει.

v. 679 Even the godless monster himself, in his rage at not finding vengeance ready at hand, is let to exclaim:-

πρὸς θεῶν, πεφύγας' ἢ μένονσ' εἰδὼ δόμον;

The origin of the Götter-Gedanken is somewhat doubtful. That they believe in Aphrodite (v. 70) is not surprising.

### Medea.

vv. 413-14 The chorus voice a sentiment



bravely induced by misfortune:

θεῶν δ' οὐκέτι πίστις ἄραρ.

vv. 192-4 Thesea reproaches Poseidon for having broken his oath:-

ῥῆκ' οὐδ' ἔτι πίστις, οὐδ' ἔτι μαθεῖν  
εἰ θεοὺς νοῦίβεις τοὺς τί' οὐκ ἄρχειν ἔτι  
ἢ καὶ νῦν κεῖσθαι θεοὺς ἀνθρώποις τῶ νῦν.

vv. 519-20 Thesea tries to give emphasis to his assertion:-

ἀλλ' οὖν ἐγὼ μὲν δαίμονας μαρτύρομαι  
ὡς πάνθ' ὑπορρεῖν σοὶ τε καὶ τέκνῳ θεῶν.

v. 631 K' ἵπρις in this choral song is in a floating state, between abstract and concrete.  
So again in v. 645.

v. 714 Thesea wishing Cyrenas good fortune in offspring:-

οὕτως ἔπος σοὶ πρὸς θεῶν τελεσφόρος  
γένετο παῖδων.





and Olympus thanks her (vv. 720-1)

πρῶτα μὲν θεῶν  
ἔπειτα παίδων.

vv. 726-7 The sea, administering the oath to Olympus adjures the Earth and Sun, but further adds:

θεῶν τε συντιθεῖς ἅπαν γένος,  
which Olympus repeats by the words θεός  
τε πάντας (v. 753).

v. 759 ff. The chorus hope that the son  
of Minn may exert the couple up to station.

v. 767 The sea, for her part, prays:

ὦ Ζεῦ Δίκη τε Ζηνὸς Ἥλιόν τε φῶς.

v. 802 The chorus uses the familiar  
expression οὐν θεῶ (cf. v. 625, ἴσως γάρ,  
οὐν θεῶ δ' εἰρήσεται):-

ὅς ἡμῖν οὐν θεῶ τίσσι δίκην.

v. 915 So to his children Jason says:



Πατήρ

Πρόδιν ἔθηκε σὺν θεοῖς προνοίαν.

The birds there never grow (v. 1113)

Τάδδ' αὖ δ' ἐξερπάζεται

Πατήρ τε καὶ θεῶν ὅστις ἐστὶν εὐνοίας.

v. 107 The citation of the old proverb shows how thoroughly familiar to the character is the whole religious sphere: -

Πείθειν δῶρα καὶ θεοῖς λόγους.

vv. 1013-14 Here Medea wishes to involve the gods in her evil inspiration: -

Ταῦτα γὰρ θεοὶ

καὶ κακῶς φρονεῖν' εὐχραντοῖαν.

v. 1115 The trouble and anxiety over children is one we give, according to the notions of the Greeks, imposed by the gods upon mortals.

v. 1172 When Medea's poison first began to take effect on the person of Glauk the son



de attendant thought

ἢ Πανὸς ὄψ' ἢ τινὸς θεῶν υἱοῦν.

v. 1208 Her father, coming on the corpse, cried out:-

τίς σ' ὥς ἀτίμως λυμάνων ἀπώλεσε;

v. 1270 The chorus has the phrase

θεύθεν πύτροντ' ἐπὶ λούοις ἄχῃ.

v. 1333 Jason in his last interview with Medea:-

τοῖόνδ' ἀλόσπρ' εἰς ἐμ' ἔδ' ἐκφυγαν θεοί.

v. 1352 Medea would begin to answer him at length,

εἰ μὴ Ζεὺς πατήρ ἡπινότατο.

v. 1372 Continuing her speech:-

ἴσασιν ὅστις ἤρξε Πηλοπιδῆς θεοί.

v. 1391 And in reply to his curses:

τίς δὲ κλύει σου θεὸς ἢ λυμάνων;

v. 1405 At the end Jason makes one last





appeal to heaven:

Ζεῦ, τὰδ' ἀκούεις ὡς ἀπτελευνόμεθ' ;

He bewails his lot,

μαρτυρούμενος δαίμονας (v. 1410).

There are several exclamations of πρὸς θεῶν (vv. 670, 1277, 1402).

### Notes.

Considerable fault is found by mortals in this play with Phœbus, for his course of medicine. This is perhaps largely due to subsequent inconvenience experienced by the individuals themselves.

Ref. vv. 28 (Φοῖβον ἀδικίαν), 76 (εἰς Φοῖβον ἀναφέροντα τὴν ἁμαρτίαν), 285 (Λόξια δὲ μέμφουσι), 545 (ἐκεῖνον [sc. Ἀπόλλωνα] ἤγεϊσθ' ἀνέμω). — If scepticism as to his existence there is, however, not an inkling.



v. 2 ~~at~~ the very beginning Electra speaks of  
συνορᾷ θείδας.

v. 121 Then characterizes Crete and Electra  
as

τοῖν τ' ἄλλων τοῖνδ' οὐς ἀπώλεσεν θεός.

v. 355 The chorus on Menelaus's success:-

θεόθεν πράξας ἄπερ νῦν.

v. 418 After Menelaus and Crete, have  
jointly answered Phobus, the latter comes out  
with

σοφεύσμεν θεοῖς, ὃ τι πῶτ' εἰσὶν οἱ θεοί.

v. 419 Menelaus asks:

ἤτ' οὐκ ἄνους + λογίους τοῖς τοῖς κακοῖς;

and Crete answers μέλλει (v. 420). - The  
situation is somewhat akin to that in the  
Ion, where the god allows mortals to take their  
own way for a long time and endures a deal  
of abuse before he finally reveals his wisdom.



v. 534 *Lyndareus* urges *Menelaus* not to depend *Crestes*:

Τοῖσιν θεοῖς μὴ πρῶσ' ἐναντί'.

This advice he repeats at v. 624:-

μὴ τῷδ' ἀσέβειν γόνον ἐναντίον θεοῖς.

v. 687 *Menelaus* desires divine aid to sympathise with *Crestes*:

Τὸ δ' αὖ δύνασθαι πρὸς θεῶν κρείσσειν.

v. 974 *Electra* speaks of *Calypso*:-

φθόρος νιν εἶλε θεῶθεν.

vv. 1361-2 By the Chorus:-

Σὶ δὲ Σίκας ἔβα θεῶν  
νέμεσσις ἐς Ἑλέαν.

vv. 1497-8 The Phrygian announces the disappearance of *Helen*

ἥτοι φαρμάκισιν ἢ μάγων  
τέχναισιν ἢ θεῶν κλοπαῖ.

v. 1560 *Crestes* regrets his failure to stop *Helen*:





εἰ γὰρ κατέσχευ' αὐτὸν θεῶν κλεφθεὶς ὕπο.

vv. 1664-5 Apollo, the deus ex machina,  
 vindicates his course to a certain extent in  
 answer, as it were, to the ignorant murmuring  
 against him:-

Τὰ πρὸς πόλιν δὲ τῶδ' ἐγὼ θήσω καλῶς,  
 ὅς νιν φονεῦσαι κατέρ' ἐβανύμεθα.

v. 1667 And Orestes, whose utterances have  
 several times bordered on atheism, seems to  
 acknowledge his error:-

οὐ ψευδόμενός τις ἦσθ' ἄρ', ἀλλ' ἐταίρους.

The exclamation πρὸς θεῶν is frequent  
 in this drama (vv. 92, 351, 579 - with a half  
 apology - , 747, 787, 1031). Cf. ὦ θεοί (v. 385)

### Proades.

v. 28 Pausan states one of the first effects



of disaster upon a city :-

VOCEI TÀ TŪN ΘΕΩΝ, Οὐδὲ τιμᾶσθαι θέλει.

v. 55-b. He presently asks Athena of her mission :-

αὐτὴν ἐκ θεῶν τῶν καὶ νῦν ἀγγελεῖς ἔπος,

ἢ Ζηνὸς ἢ καὶ Διαιούων τινὸς πάρα;

It is natural to be taken for granted that the gods in their conversation assume their own existence as true, but the casual tone is possibly worth remarking.

v. 308 Cassandra uses anthropomorphic language. The Trojan was δῖα μέαν Κύπριν.

v. 470 Hector, after charging the gods with being poor allies, continues :-

οὐκ ἔχει τις σῆμα κικλήσκων θεοῦ,

ὅταν τις ἡμῶν δυστοχῇ λάβῃ τύχην.

v. 612 "Mother of Hector," asks Athena proudly, "do you behold these horrors?" Hector responds.



ὅρῳ τὰ τῶν θεῶν.

v. 696 Further on Helen says:

νικᾷ γὰρ οὐκ ἄνθρωπος ἰδύδων.

v. 740 Helen lays all the responsibility for her escapade upon Cypris. Having related the "judgement of Paris," she says of the man himself:

ἦλθ' οὐχὶ μικρὸν θεὸν ἔχων αὐτοῦ μέγα.

Her advice to Menelaus is (v. 748):-

τὴν θεὸν κόλαζε καὶ Διὸς κρείσσων γενεῦ.

(For Zeus is slave of Cypris.)

Here Helen doubtless finds the anthropomorphic view of nature advantageous for her purpose. Helen well sums up the rationalistic theory when she says (v. 788):-

ὁ τοῦ δ' ἰδὼν νῦν νῦν ἐπαΐθῃ Κύπρις.

Two things, however, must be remembered in this connection, - 1) that Helen's words also have an impelling motive; regarding





Helen as the cause of all the woes of Troy she is filled with hate against her; 2) that she is not an out and out rationalist, as is seen from other parts of the poem!

Menelaus inclines to Teucra's way of thinking (v. 1038), but Helen sticks well to her story (vv. 1042-3), so that we cannot be positive but she means all she says:-

οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλος τὸν νόον τὸν τῶν θεῶν  
προσθεῖς ἐμὸν κτάνης, με.

v. 1174 Teucra calls the walls of Ilium  
Δοξίου πυρρῶματα.

vv. 1280-81 Above in these lines how she manifests a belief in the reality of the gods, though not in their readiness to help:-

ὦ θεοί, καὶ τί τοὺς θεοὺς καλῶ;  
καὶ πρὶν γὰρ οὐκ ἤκουσαν ἀναπαύμεναι.

Cf. her exclamation ὦ θεοί (v. 469)



Phoenissae.

vr. 18 Jocasta recites the oracle:

μὴ σπεῖρ τέκνον ἄλκα δαμόων Βία.

vr. 151-2 The little Antigone prays destruction on Parthenopaeus:

ἄδδ' αὖ νιν ἅ κατ' ὕρην μετὰ κατέρος

Ἄρτεμις ἱεμένα τόξοις δαμάσας' ὀλέσειν.

But the pedagogue answers (vr. 154-5):-

οὐδ' εἰς δίκη δ' ἤκουσι γόνι,

ὅ καὶ δεδούκα μὴ σκοπῶς' ὕρῃς θεοί.

vr. 257-8 Of course the chorus chant:-

δειμαίνω τὰν σὰν ἀλκὰν

καὶ τὸ θεόθεν.

vr. 379 and 382 Jocasta:-

κακῶς θεῶν τις Οἰδίπουν φασίει γένος.

ἀτὰρ τί ταῦτα; δεῖ φέρειν τὰ τῶν θεῶν.

v. 491 Polynices, too, speaks in proper religious fashion



αἴψτως δὲ τῷδε σώουρας καλῶ.  
 where τῷδε is explained by ἀποστεροῦμαι  
 πατρίδος.

v. 555 ff. Tereus's idea of stewardship  
 is a truly high one:

οὗτοι τὰ χρεῖατ' ἴδια κέκτανται βροτῶν,  
 τὰ τῶν θεῶν δ' ἔχοντες ἐπιμελούμεθα.  
 ὅταν δὲ χρεῖσω', αὐτ' ἀφαιροῦνται πάντα.

v. 689 The chorus conclude a prayer  
 to Demeter and Persephone with

πάντα δ' εὐπαινεῖ θεοῖς.

v. 811 Tereias describes the blinding of  
 Oedipus as

θεῶν τόφισμα καὶ πίδεισι Ἰλῆαδι  
 and the children of the king as

θεοῖς ὄψιν δραιομένην (v. 813).

By Icarus's threats at his predictions, Te-  
 reias assents





ἂ δὲ κεῖ τὰ τῶν θεῶν.

v. 1181 Zeus practically acts as deus ex machina in demolishing Capaneus.

vv. 1198-9 The conclusion of the messenger's account:-

εἰ δ' εὐτυχῆς

ἔσται τὸ λοιπὸν ἡδε γῆ, θεοῖς υέλει.

Cf. again comment on Barthae 1150. This speech, too, is an exceedingly long one.

v. 1365 ff. Notice how Polyneices and Etocles before beginning battle call respectively upon Hera and Pallas to champion their cause. (Conditions are similar to Trach. 347-8).

v. 1614 Oedipus avers that he could not of his own motion have wrought such ruin (ὥστ' ἄνευ θεῶν τοῦ ταῦτ' ἐμνηχανοσάμεν).

The exclamation πρὸς θεῶν occurs at vv. 572, 1083; ὦ θεοί, vv. 586, 608.



Fragmenta.

Conclusions from the fragments must be necessarily somewhat so a limited in scope. It is impossible to supply fully the characterization and circumstances which impelled any given utterance. The thread end will, however, have been reached, if the general purport of the passages cited is shown to accord closely with similar notions expressed in extant plays.

F. 162 (Antigone). In these few lines, love is twice personified as Eros.

F. 177 (Antigone). At the address to Dionysus, — ὦ παῖ Διῶνος.

F. 207 (Antigone). Directed to the part of the gods.  
ἐὶ σ' ἦνευ λάθην ἐκ θεῶν καὶ παῖδ' εὐαί.

F. 256 (Archelaus). This scarcely makes for optimism:

A. πόλλ', ὦ τέκνον, σφάλλουσιν ἀνθρώποις φρονί.



B. τὸ πᾶσιν εἶπας, αἰτιάσασθαι θεούς.

F. 257 (Chalcidius). The first two lines are  
δοκεῖς τὰ τῶν θεῶν νικῆσειν ποτὲ  
καὶ τὴν δίκην πού μιν ἀπακίσθαι βροτῶν,  
ideas which the speaker goes on to contradict.  
F. 258 (Chalcidius).

μακάριος ὅστις νοῦν ἔχων τιμᾷ θεόν κτλ.

Chalk suggests θεός as a possibly later writing.

F. 258 (Bellerophon). A. discusses the attitude  
against the very existence of the gods. There is  
evidence and characterization back of this.

F. 294 (Bellerophon). In l. 5 some diseases  
are described as ἐκ θεῶν, in opposition to  
ἐνθάπτεται. The speaker adds further:

εἰ θεοὶ οὐδ' ἔστιν αἰσχρὸν, οὐκ εἶναι θεῶν.  
The exact bearing of this passage cannot be  
determined. The statement is, however, not a  
radical one.





F. 313 (Heliographontes). Among the good points of the hero, as recounted, one is

ἦοθ' εἰς θεῶν μὲν εὐσεβής.

F. 327 (Lanai). The speaker evidently regards sacrifices to the gods (vv. 6-7) as a pious act.

F. 334 (Lictys). The "law" of love toward offspring is further defined as

καὶ θεοῖσι τοῦτο δόξαν.

F. 336 (Lictys). Line 1 contains an active personification of Hades.

Fraggs. 341 and 342 (Lictys). Note the personified Κύπρις three times, - the last time with τὴν Διός for an additional attribute.

F. 345 (Thyestes). The statement occurs:  
οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲν χυπὸς ὑπαίτιος ἑῶν

F. 431 (Hippolytus). Again the favorite figure of Cypris. Here, however, she was very possibly a participating character.



f. 734 (Hippolytus), Love rules the universe,  
and even Zeus cannot bar him out.

f. 747 (Hippolytus). Evils are spoken of as  
θεήματα, as well as ἐμφοται.

f. 762 (Cephalotes). For the sake, as it were,  
of an expression pretty opposite the poet calls  
Εἰρήνην

καλλίστα τῶν μακάρων θεῶν (l. 2)!

f. 775 (Cretes). Minos is termed by the chorus  
τέκνον Εὐρώπης

καὶ τοῦ μεγάλου Ἰνός.

Fragg. 783 and 784 (Melanippe Pentemeter). These  
fragments, side by side, help to show how much  
more important in the plays is artistic delineation  
of character than inculcation of doctrine.

The first is the much quoted

Zeis ὅστις ὁ Zeus, οὐ γὰρ οἶδα πᾶν λόγον.

The second reports quite correctly the established



mythology:

Ζεὺς, ὡς δέδεκται τῆς ἀνθείας ὕπνο  
 "Ἐδδον" ἐτεκτεν.

One character is obvious: a bit free in  
 opinion, the poet holds to his childhood's faith.

F. 791 (Melanippe Ruler). Father is named  
 οἰκνοῖς Διός.

F. 797 (Melanippe Captive). This fragment  
 protests against ad. vng children, giving as  
 a reason:

ὦ γὰρ θεοὶ διδῶσι μὴ φῶναι τέκνα  
 οὐ γὰρ μάχεσθαι πρὸς τὸ θεῖον, ἀλλ' ἔαν.

F. 508 (Melanippe Captive). This passage  
 completes the notion that Zeus records offences of  
 mortals, by saying that the whole heaven would  
 not suffice for the tablets, - a truly rationalistic  
 touch. The tone of the whole fragment is not  
 rationalistic, however: its aim is, rather to





ascend *Ilion* (as frequently) as the chief head-  
man of Zeus.

Fr. 528 (Peleus). Kóppis again, this time  
τῷ σκότῳ φίλῃ.

Fr. 534 (Peleus). The huntress Atlanta  
is called Kóppidos μέγαν?

Fr. 574 (Perithoos). Pericles ascribes  
his descent from Zeus with the phrase already  
seen above (Fr. 484) - ὡς λέκεται τῆς ἀληθείας  
ὑπὸ.

Fr. 669 (Philoos). The character thus explains  
certain confusions:

οὐκ ἔστι τὰ θεῶν ἄδικ', ἐν ἀνθρώποισι δὲ  
κακοῖς νοσοῦντα τύχῃ σιν πολλὰν ἔχει.

Fr. 685 (Cynae), vv. 2-3. It is related as a  
matter "contrary to expectation" that οἱ εὐσεβέωντες  
εἰς Ἀχαιοὺς μὲν with σωματὰ κλαυρά.

Fr. 724 (Telephus). The notice occurs:



θεῖσι μὴ μάχων,

along with the expectation that heaven has put  
down the might from their seats, esp. F. 720:

τόλμα οὐ κἄν τι τραχὺ νεύωσιν θεοί.

F. 761 (Phaithon), v. 14 ff. Here follows an  
elaborate hymn to Aphrodite. We have a  
recurrence of the epithet θεῶν κἀδδισσα as  
applied to Cerynis. v. 75 contains a personifica-  
tion of fire as Ἡφαίστος.

F. 792 (Philoctetes). One must person-  
ify another, to imitate the gods in the  
pursuit of acquiring wealth (κεῖδος λαβῆν), since  
even the deities strive to surpass one another  
in quantity of gold locked in their temples.

F. 797 (Philoctetes). The speaker's utterance  
is perhaps influenced by some misfortune, but  
at all events he seems temporarily sincere:

γεῦ, ἀπὸς εἶναι ἄδδω πᾶσι θεοῖσι φίλον



ὡς τῶν τελευτῶν, καὶ βραδύνουσιν χρόνον.

F. 132 (Phaedrus). The epic poet is told that, through the mediation of Δίκη, it is impossible τοὺς θεοὺς ἀεὶ ἀνέμεναι.

Fragmenta Incerta.

F. 925.

παιδαῖοι κορφαῖς δὲ θεοὶ σοφισμάτων  
σφάλλουσιν ἡμᾶς κρείσσονες πεφυκότες.

F. 970. Taciturnity is declared advantageous.

F. 971 strongly affirms the existence of Zeus and the gods.

F. 1030 The gods must be more necessary than mortals, if the world overlooks great crimes.

F. 1001 contains the warning αὐτὴν βιάσθαι θεοὺς.

F. 1003 says that just and wise men will not, even in misfortune, be angry against the gods.

F. 1007 has the familiar statement that Zeus





was rather of evils to the Romans and worst to the  
Greeks.

And so we see, woven into the very warp  
and woof of Euripides's compositions, these common-  
place ideas of Gods, as such ideas existed in  
his own day. Not that there are no opposite  
notions brought forward; a sameness of  
religious temperament would ill befit a  
thought so various as the poet has summoned  
up; but these contrary opinions are in  
any case no stronger and no more numerous  
than confessions of faith.

Here is where Buxton's little essay greatly  
serves, by citing at random, as the tragedian's  
own, expressions from the most contrasted  
conditions and characters. Nor does he need  
matter much by discounting mistakes and

1. See Bibliography, p. 339.



contradictions in advance (Vorwort, p. 4).

Of course I am not trying to show that Euripides was himself a firm believer. That thesis would be too ridiculous. There are abundant evidences that he was profoundly influenced by philosophic and rationalistic speculations of the age. Equally absurd, however, it is to say that the wolfish maw of atheism was constantly peering out from beneath the innocent white face of drama. No man can serve God and Mammon (at the same time, at least), nor art and rationalism, — nor flow hot and cold with the same breath. It must be acknowledged that there is occasionally an attempt at some little popular dissemination of the new doctrine, but it is only incidental to the whole grand scheme. We are not obliged to examine



with Terrell, that for "the master" inconsistent action of divinities was the main consideration, but rather believe that the consistent action of mortals was for him more attractive. Most of the characters, as is appropriate to a piece said in heroic times, are God-fearing, God-believing individuals. At intervals, in storm and stress, they doubt or blaspheme, and then as like as not with a return of good fortune are again converted. On the other hand, they may in prosperity forget their service to higher powers, only to call on them in adversity and danger. These are human traits. We shall not go far wrong if we hold to Euripides the artist, first and foremost. The explanation of his tragedies must then be sought somewhere else than in the destruction of reality and secret

1. Cf. even in Sophocles the attitude of Philocetes at Phil. 752.





1844 -

grotesque.



Euipides not inevitably condemned  
by  
Aristotle's Remarks.

Precedents of the Scusex Machine:  
Analogies:

Frequency in other Ancient Literature.



There are two passages of Aristotle's Poetics which refer especially to the structure of Euripides's plays. They are usually regarded as intended to condemn the poet's method. On this matter Verrall has written at some length (pp. 206-12 of the book already mentioned), and the whole subject is so well treated that I have ventured to summarize it.

Aristotle was preparing a manual of poetic composition, not attempting an "appreciation" of any author. He adduced examples, on points of detail, from works which were at hand. The Iliad and Odyssey might, in his opinion, serve as sufficient models of narrative poetry: for dramatic poetry he found no safe models extant. Of escholus little is said. Among the plays of Euphrades the Oedipus Rex is several times provided for the treatment of plot. In this





particular it coincided more closely than most dramas with the critics' notions. Other pieces receive scant or unfavorable attention. Euripides is frequently cited, but altogether to illustrate details. Tragic is sometimes bestowed, sometimes denied. There is no sweeping condemnation of him anywhere. The drama of the fifth century, in fine, was based at least partly upon principles inconsistent with Aristotle's teachings.

So much is Tindal's view. Much the same impression may be obtained from a casual glance at the table of contents, as given in Butler's edition (pp. 2-3). The general scheme of the work is seen to be of the text-book variety, - an enumeration of principles, not an account of existing literature.

With these facts established, some of the



from the first of the two passages, - Poetics  
XIII, 4 ff. :-

ὁ καὶ οἱ Εὐριπίδης ἐκλαδύνει τούτ' αὐτὸ  
μαρτάνουσιν ὅτι τούτοις ὅρα ἐν ταῖς τραγωδίαις  
καὶ πρὸ αὐτῶν εἰς δυστυχίαν τελευτῶσιν. τούτο  
γὰρ ἔστιν ὥσπερ εἴρηται ὀρθόν. σπουδαιότερον δὲ μέ-  
γιστον· ἐπὶ γὰρ τῶν σκημῶν καὶ τῶν ἀγώνων  
τραγικώταται αἱ τελευταὶ φαίνονται, ἂν κατορθωθῶ-  
σιν, καὶ ὁ Εὐριπίδης, εἰ καὶ τὰ ἄλλα μὴ εὖ  
οἰκονομεῖ, ἀλλὰ τραγικώτατός γε τῶν πηκτῶν  
φαίνεται.

On this cf. Vennart's footnote, pp. 210-11.  
What some would make the words εἰ καὶ τὰ  
ἄλλα μὴ εὖ οἰκονομεῖ imply is a criticism  
so far reaching that Aristotle presumably would  
not have "raised and dismissed it in the  
tail of a paragraph." It would be comme  
ce throughgoing a demonstration with a



throughgoing complement. Butcher's translation runs: "Euripides, faulted as he is in the general management of his subject, yet is felt to be the most tragic of poets." — Verrill varies to: "though otherwise managing not rightly." — To me it seems that the words will admit of a less harsh interpretation. First, I would represent εἰ by "in case." τὴν αἰδῶν αἰδῶν need not be admiring, nor accented of specification: it may be taken as direct object of ἰκονομεῖ and quite literally signify "the other matter." "Matters" must take its coloring from the context, and apparently refers to the many small points passed in review by Aristotle in his treatise, — in regard to some of which, as we have seen, Euripides met the approbation, in regard to others, the disapproval of the author. The whole





sentence, then, reads: "Empiricus, even in case he fails to manage the other details well, at all events shows himself possessed of this tragic quality most of the poets." The "possessed of this tragic quality" I have tried to indicate the close relationship between τραγικώτατος and the τραγικότητα above, which in turn is strictly limited to αἱ τοιαῦται (sc. τραγωδίαε). Such a relationship makes τραγικώτατος applicable to the subject in hand, - i. e. the advantage of unhappy endings. This result has been reached by both Bühner and Verrill.

What is the upshot of it all? Aristotle is laying stress on τραγικώτατος, on the way in which Empiricus regularly comes out with a sad conclusion (right, from Aristotle's standpoint), even though he may spend at times against the canons of the poetic <sup>art</sup> theory, for



the more standpoint). The fact must be remembered that Aristotle might have used the clause εἰ καὶ τὰ αὐτὰ αὐτὸ εἶναι σκοπεῖ with equal justice and applicability of Sophocles or of Aeschylus.

If, then, we are ready to grant that he makes no wholesale condemnation of Euripides's economy, we may proceed to consider what he says about the μηχανή. The passage is in Poetics XV, 7: -

φανερὸν οὖν ὅτι καὶ τὰς λύσεις τῶν μυστηρίων  
ἐξ αὐτοῦ δεῖ τοῦ αὐθοῦ συμβαίνειν, καὶ αὐτὸ  
ὥσπερ ἐν τῇ Μυθίᾳ ἀπὸ μηχανῆς καὶ ἐν  
τῇ Ἰλιάδι τὰ περὶ τὸν ἀπόπλουον, ἀλλὰ, μηχανῇ  
χρηστὴν ἐπὶ τῷ ἔσω τοῦ δράματος, ἢ  
ὅσα πρὸ τοῦ μέλλοντος ἀνὴρ διὰ τὸ ἄνθρωπον  
εἰδέναι, ἢ ὅσα ὥσπερ ὁ δεῖται προαγορεύσεως  
καὶ ἀγγελίας· ἅπαντα γὰρ ἀποδίδουεν τοῖς θεοῖς



Sp̃ar.

Is the attempt worth while to make the dramas of Euripides coincide with the thesauri here laid down? It seems more than doubtful. We are still dealing with a text-book for the future, not with a judgement on the past. Tervall would agree to have the right of it in saying (p. 211):- "Euripides did not, any more than the other dramatists of the great age, furnish by his general practice or in a single case a perfectly satisfactory example of the Aristotelian method." Schrader to a certain extent forces his results. In the Telema, Epheum, Leucis, and Arctos the primary motive of the god is action; the prophecy is comparatively an afterthought. I believe the same to be true, though less obvious, elsewhere, as will be developed. It was the feeling of this





which called forth Schlegel's remarks. There is a curious bit of non sequitur in Aristotle's own statement. By ἡνάρη παρ' ἀποδιδούκῃ τοῖς θεοῖς ἰστῶν he shows that he has in mind the θεὸς ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπων, yet he adduces for illustration the Medea, which can only belong to the regular group of analogy. Some contend that it is not at all the Medea of Euripides which is here meant.

It is best to say frankly that Euripides in this point disagrees with Aristotle, and is more the worse for it. The æsthetic of the fourth century was good, but the creative genius of the fifth was, in its way and day, better.

To realize how natural the Medea must have seemed to the Greeks of Euripides's age,



we have only to recall the free and easy inter-  
course of gods and men in the Homeric poems, the  
tradition of the nocturnal wounds of Asclepius,  
and the rage, - not wholly political, - at the mutila-  
tion of the Terminus (about 715 B.C.). Although  
acts and motives human and divine are closely  
intertwined throughout the course of Iliad and  
Odyssey, it is still possible to select certain  
dramatic instances of interference, where the  
veritable deus ex machina shows himself. Smith  
in his essay proposed to trace the phenomenon  
as a whole from this source. He gives on p. 10  
one example (Il. II, 373) as a type of many. An  
extended list is here set forth.

Il. I, 194. Achilles, in the act of drawing  
his sword against Agamemnon, is stopped  
by Athena. Her words (v. 216) remind us decidedly



of a Euripidean deus:

ἄλλ' ἄγε ἄνψ' ἔπος, ἀνδὲ Σίγος ἔλκεο χερσὶ.

She prefaces her command with an expression of doubt, αἶ' κε Πιθναί (v. 207); this, however, considering its position as a tag, is probably not significant. Athena comes out of her own accord, but at Hera's bidding (cf. her appearance for Apollo at the box of the Ton).

Il. I, 155. Hera again interferes, to prevent the return of the Greeks. Her method is more indirect than in the previous case. She urges Athena, who urges Odysseus to urge the people. Cf. the second passage from Aristotle, at the opening of this section.

Il. III, 373. This is the verse cited by Plutarch. Expedition saves Paris from Menelaus, and carries him safely away.

Il. II, 22. Zeus sends Hera for





diomedes by encircling him in darkness.

Il. I, 311. Aphrodite prevents Helen from diomedes, carrying him to another spot.

Il. I, 388. Venus prevents Helen from being betrayed at the hands of Aeneas and Echeclus.

Il. VIII, 130. Zeus by hurling a thunderbolt kills diomedes of further success before Troy. Nestor interprets the god's will.

Il. VIII, 217. Hera keeps the Trojans from setting fire to the Greek ships, - indirectly, as before, by putting a suggestion into the heart of Agamemnon.

Il. XI, 750. Patroclus saves the Trojan Priests from Hector.

Il. XII, 270. The dew is here printed. Zeus helps Hector to reach the ship, by lending aid to Polydamas.

Il. XV, 454. Zeus sends the arrow of



Teucer saves from Hector.

Il. XVI, 678. Apollo on the walls hinders the conquest of Ilium.

Il. XVII, 70. Apollo stops Menelaus from carrying off the armor of Euphorbus. The method is indirect. He rouses up Hector against the son of Atreus.

Il. XVII, 321. Apollo once more, by inciting Menas, holds the Greeks in check.

Il. XVIII, 165. Hera through the medium of Iris, sent to Achilles, prevents the capture of Patroclus's corpse.

Il. XX, 72. Menas describes his rescue by Iris from Achilles and the latter's helper, Athena.

Il. XX, 290. Poseidon interests himself for Menas, thus preserving him from death.

Il. XXI, 211. The river, personifying



with Achilles, puts an end to the slaughter of  
Troians.

Il. XXI, 47. Apollo again interposes in  
behalf of Troy. Agam is his instrument.

Il. XXII, 202. The positive influence of  
the deus is once more illustrated. Apollo  
strengthens Hector to escape Achilles a few  
moments longer.

Il. XXIII, 382. This is a case of à cor-  
saire, corsaire et demi. Apollo interposes  
with Minos in the chariot-race, by despoiling  
the cash from his hand. Athena retaliates  
by restoring the cash to Minos, and over-  
turns the vehicle of Eumelos.

Od. IV, 364 Menelaus tells how Eidothea  
saved his men and goods from ruin in  
Egypt by arranging an interview with  
Proteus.





Od. V, +26. Athena, inspiring the mind of Odysseus, keeps him from being crushed against the cliffs of Phaeacia.

Od. V, +36. Likewise, when he has reached shallow water, she wards off destruction by placing "discretion" in his heart.

Od. XXIV, 528. And at the very close of the poem Athena brings to a conclusion, by sudden interference, the conflict between the party of Odysseus and the Phaeacians.

In almost every one of the above passages the language is noteworthy. The statement is distinctly made that the natural course of events (Aristotle's τὰ ἐξ αὐτοῦ τοῦ νόθου συμβαίνοντα) would have led to a certain result but for the interest or interference of a deity. E. G., Il. XVI, 698 and 700-701:

ἐνθα κεν ὑψίποδον Τρώϊον ἔδωκ' ὤϊος Ἀχιλλῆος



εἰ καὶ Ἀπόλλων Φοῖβος εὐδαιμόντου ἐνὶ πύργῳ  
ἔσται, τῷ ὁδοῖ ὁρμῶν, Τρώεσσι δ' ἀπῆλυν.

The Greeks were not the only ancient people, however, who had ideas of divine assistance at critical moments. A survey of the Old Testament brings to light a number of situations that may be set side by side with those in Homer. And, as in Homer, one must be careful not to find too many of them. The interests of Deborah and her people are constantly intermingled; he aids them very frequently by prophecies or subtle promptings. Still, the following passages seem to exhibit a close resemblance to the ordinary functions of a deus ex machina.

Numbers XXII, 22. In the episode of Balaam's ass, an angel blocks the way against



Heaven; for his pronunciation, to whom the  
apparition is invisible, the ass miraculously  
speaks. Then comes the statement (v. 33):

καὶ εἰ μὴ ἐξέκλινεν, νῦν οὖν σὲ μὲν ἀπ-  
έκτεινα, ἐκείνῳ δὲ περιποίησάμην.

Joshua X, 11. This is the battle between  
Joshua and the five Amorite kings.

ἐν τῷ δὲ φεύγειν αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ ἰσραήλ  
τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ ἐπὶ τῆς καταβάσεως Ἰσ-  
ραεὶν, καὶ Κύριος ἐπέριψεν αὐτοῖς λίθους  
χαλάσας ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἕως Ἀζυκά· καὶ  
ἐρέοντο πλείους οἱ ἀποθανόντες σὺ τοὺς λίθους  
..... ἢ οὐς ἀπέκτειναν οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ

Just beyond is the account of the sun's  
standing still. This is, however, in direct  
answer to prayer, and therefore excluded  
from the present category.

Joshua XXIV. The rehearsal by Joshua





of all the help given to Israel by Deborah is  
not coming in this general connection.

Judges VII, 22. Gideon against the  
"children of the east." When the force of three  
hundred beat down their trumpets, on  
the opposite side

ἔθηκεν Κύριος τὴν προμάχαν ἀνδρὶς ἐν  
τῷ πλῑσίῳ αὐτοῦ ἐν πάσῃ τῇ παρεμβολῇ.  
καὶ ἔσθον ἡ παρεμβολὴ ἕως Βηθσεעדὰ Γα-  
ρριζὴν.

I Kings XVIII, 38. Compare the descent  
of fire from heaven in the trial between Elijah  
and the priests of Baal.

II Kings XIX, 35. The destruction of Sen-  
nacherib.

καὶ ἐγένετο νύκτος καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἄγγελος  
Κυρίου καὶ ἐπάταξεν ἐν τῇ παρεμβολῇ τῶν  
Ἀσσυρίων ἑκατὸν ὑδραῖα καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς



καὶ ὕψθρισαν τὸ πρῶν, καὶ ἰδοὺ πάντες σώματα νεκρά.

See the story of the same event, II. Chronicle, XXXII, 21:-

καὶ ἀπέστειλεν Κύριος ἄγγελον· ἐξέτηρξεν πᾶν δυνατὸν καὶ πολεμιστὴν καὶ ἄρχοντα καὶ στρατηγὸν ἐν τῇ παρεμβολῇ βασιλέως Ασσυρίαν.

Daniel III, 25. The King beholds the miraculous preservation of Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego:-

ὅδε ἐστὶν ἱππῶν ἄνδρας τέσσαρες λεγόμενοι καὶ περιπατοῦντας ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ πυρός, καὶ διαφθερὰ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἡ ὄρασις τοῦ τετάρτου οὐσία σὺν θεοῦ (a variant here is ὁμοίωμα ἄγγελου θεοῦ).

If, now, a step be taken to the Old Testament, a similar instance or two may be found ready at hand.



Acts IX 5-6. Saul, on his way to persecute the Christians of Damascus, is stopped.

εἶπεν δὲ· Τίς εἶ, κύριε; ὁ δὲ ἔγωγε εἰμι Ἰνσοῦς ὃν σὺ διώκεις· ἀλλὰ ἀνέστη καὶ εἰσελθε εἰς τὴν πόλιν, καὶ λαλήσεις αὐτοῖς ὅτι σε δεῖ ποιεῖν. — The whole course of his life is thus changed.

Acts XII, 7. Peter is asleep in Herod's prison, under guard.

καὶ ἰδὼν ἄγγελος Κυρίου ἐπέσθη, καὶ αὐτὸς ἔλαμψεν ἐν τῷ οἰκήματι· πατάξας δὲ τὴν πλευρὰν τοῦ Πέτρου ἤγειρεν αὐτὸν λέγων· Ἀνάστα ἐν τάχει· καὶ ἐξέπεσαν αὐτοῦ αἱ ἀλύσεις ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν. Being further ordered to accompany the messenger he does so, although ἐδόκει ὄραμα βλέπειν.

Acts XII, 23. Herod has just been hailed by the people as a god.





Παραχρῆμα δὲ ἐπάταξεν αὐτὸν ἄγγελος  
Κυρίου ἀπ' ὧν οὐκ ἔδωκεν τὰν δόξαν τῷ  
θεῷ, καὶ γενόμενος σκωληκόβρωτος ἐξέψυσεν.

Even one of these cases (all from narrative),  
both Greek and Hebrew, may be expanded by  
the imagination into a kind of one-act drama,  
with a deus ex machina for climax. The  
examples from the Old and New Testament  
must make us feel that to a believing  
audience the device is not necessarily un-  
dramatic. For modern playwrights, - Then it  
from a conscientious and experienced actor, -  
the actor, where available, is a figure of intense  
dramatic interest. Yet aesthetically a personifi-  
cation of evil is doubtless something that we  
cannot away with.

Instances of interference from heaven are



met with, too, in the Sanskrit Drama, though this is for the most part later than the Greek. In that account I am inclined to believe that the Mahā-Bharata Epic would afford a fairer test. Still, I have selected from H. F. Wilson's Theatre of the Hindus the following :-

Vd. I, p. 198. The action of Purūravas and Urvashi begins with an appeal for help by nymphs, one of whose number Savitri the demon has carried off. Instantly Purūravas and his charioteer appear driving in mid-air: he pursues, and rescues Urvashi.

Vd. I, p. 255. Purūravas discovers a ruby, which he is about to neglect, when a voice from heaven bids him examine it carefully, and at the same time sets forth its unusual virtues.



Vol. I, p. 365. There is apparently an indication of divine interference in the conversation of a male and female spirit of the air, describing a battle.

F. Sp. - "But who is this, that from his car  
 rights to intercept the war,  
 and with his gentle speech controls  
 the fury of these daring souls?"

M. Sp. - 'Tis Raghupati; he has slain  
 the fierce ascetic, and again  
 he seeks his realm. His voice they hear,  
 and cast aside the sword and spear."

Vol. II, p. 340. From the Vēṇi-Gaṇhāra.

"Karna, instigated by Aśvathāman, foregoes his anger, and is about to resume his arms, when a voice from heaven prevents him. He is obliged, therefore, to remain an idle spectator of the fight.





Vol. II, p. 372. From the Hanuman-  
Chālāka.

"Rāma returns with Sītā and his  
friends to Ayodhyā, when Aṅgada chal-  
lenges them all to fight him, as it is now  
time to revenge his father's death. A voice  
from heaven, however, tells him to be paci-  
fied, as Bālī will be born as a hunter in a  
future age, and kill Rāma, who will then  
be Kṛṣṇa: he is accordingly appeased.

Vol. II, p. 400. The Kamsa-Badha.  
In the first act of this play Kamsa, King  
of Mathurā, is alarmed by a voice from  
heaven saying that his sister's son, pre-  
destined to destroy him, has escaped the  
precautions taken against his birth.

Gītā (Er. Litgesch III, 206) mentions



the introduction of gods from the machine by Aeschylus and by Sophocles before our poet's day. The evidence for the statement, being drawn from slight fragments, is rather flimsy, but may perhaps suffice. Certainly we are not in a position to deny that many lost works of the earlier tragedians may have contained such a device. Yet granting that Euripides was the first to bring the deus to prominence, he simply transferred to the stage a conception that was common as air, natural as sunshine, and one that has ever remained more or less dear to the human heart. Those who doubt it have but to reflect on the more modern ideas of fairy godmother, good angel, patron saint, or the story of the cross in the sky appearing to Constantine





and bidding "in hoc signo vinces"; or the sign of the cross in general, - which, being a kind of pocket deus ex machina for use against the devil, scarcely possesses a parallel in ancient mythology, - and again on the magic circle.

Well managed these effects are not amiss. It is only with the crowd of inferior parts who arose after Euripides that the deus ex machina became an object of derision; just as we laugh at the Hero and Villain of rowing melodrama, but not at Hamlet and Claudius, Othello and Iago, Lear and his ungrateful daughters. We are disgusted at a Hero's speedy arrival to save the imprisoned Heroine from the baggy-saw or descending elevator, but feel little qualm at Becket's opportune approach.





in Act III of Tennyson's play, where he  
rescues Rosamund from the evil de-  
signs of Queen Eleanor. And furthermore,  
after all is said, one must remember that  
these distinctions are for persons of education,  
whereas the great mass of the people revels in  
all such distinctions alike.



Engage  
for an  
Artistic Motive.

Prominence  
of the  
Fate Idea  
in  
Speeches  
of the  
Sei ex Mulhina



Schroder did a great service for the study of Euripides when he disposed of the notion that the poet was obliged to use the machine (and *deum confutare*). The article has been already summarized (p. 80). Granting that there was no obligation, what, in the next place, was the ~~purpose~~ purpose of Euripides? Surely not to disfigure his composition, for an artist is always faithful to his art, and that Euripides was an artist the overwhelming tribute of posterity shows. Few have called forth such expressions of admiration as Philémon's :-

Εἰ ταῖς ἀνυθείαισιν οἱ τεθραγκότες  
αἰσθάντιν εἶχον ἄρσας, ὡς φησὶν τινες,  
ἀπ' ηὐξάνειν ἂν ἔστ' ἰδεῖν Εὐριπίδην.

Euripides was an emperor of artists, and that holds an artist's spirit. In his lifetime he





took only a few inferior prizes for his production. This is not surprising; the judges were often given to favoritism, and the man was not popular; even in our own enlightened days, judges at prize debates or speaking have been known to make strange awards. His age had to endure him as a neighbor: following generations saw only his works.

If, then, Euripides regarded the deus ex machina as an improvement, as adding one artistic touch the more, it remains to be seen wherein that excellence consisted and whether any guiding principle can be traced. For an answer we may well have recourse to the accounts which the gods themselves give of their missions.

Andromache.



Thetis informs to Peus that she has come because of their former marriage (χαίρει τῶν τῶν Πάρος νυμφευμάτων). But this is only a subordinate reason. At the end of her recital, when she has carefully described the course which he is to pursue, she states the originating cause that stands behind all her movements (vv. 1268-9):-

τὸ γὰρ πεπρωμένον

σεῖ δ' ἐκκλιῖσιν. Ζεὺς γὰρ δοκεῖ τάδε.

[The coupling of Fate with Zeus, as is to be elsewhere noted, is fairly customary.]

This great necessity, indeed, has already appeared (vv. 1249-50):-

οὐ γὰρ ἔδ' ἀνάσταν

σεῖ τὸ δὲ καὶ κῆρ, γέρον.

And in closing Thetis uses again a regular expression of irremediable destiny, in the matter



of death:

πᾶσιν γὰρ ἀνθρώποις ἴδε πρὸς θεῶν  
ψῆφος κέκρانتαι καθανεῖν τ' ὀφείδεται.  
πεπρωμένον, Σεῦ, κραίνω, οφείδω - all strong words

Helena.

The Dioscuri come out sooner  
with their case than did Thetis. To Thetis  
menus they declare (v. 1646):-

οὐ γὰρ πεπρωμένοισιν ὀρχίβεε γάμοις.

Further (vv. 1650-1):-

εἰς μὲν γὰρ αἰεὶ τὸν παρὶντα νῦν χρεὶν  
κείνην κατοικεῖν σοῖσιν ἐν δόμοις ἐχρην,  
but now (v. 1653):

ἐν ταῖσιν αὐτῆς σεῦ νῦν ἐδεῦχθαι γάμοις.

Why did they not rescue their sister sooner?

They explain (vv. 1660-1):

ἀλλ' ἵσσοις' ἡμεν τοῦ πεπρωμένου θ' αἶμα









(Vote v. 1264:

ἐνταῦθα καὶ σὲ δεῖ δραπεεῖν φόνου πέρι,  
also v. 1273:

σὲ δ' Ἀρκάδων χρὴ πόδιν --- οἰκεῖν  
Finally (vv. 1290-1) they conclude with  
πεπρωμένον γὰρ υἱόν σου ἐκπαιδύσας φόνου  
ἐνδαιμονήσεις.

As before in the *Helena*, the question arises  
why these gods did not act sooner in their  
sister's behalf. This time the enquiry is *pointed*  
made by the chorus: the answer resembles  
that previously given (vv. 1301-2):-

υἱόν σου ἀνέγκας ἦεν τὸ χρεὼν (primal cause)  
Φοίβου τ' ἄσφατος φάσσης ἐνοπαί (immediate cause).  
Compare the remarks on *Thetis*, above.

The *Miscuri* continue (v. 1305):-

κοινὰ πράξεις, κοινὸν δὲ πότερον.



Heracles Furios.

vv. 827-8. It is only when Fate has abandoned its protection of Heracles that Hera's enmity may send madness upon him. This abdication of destiny, primarily, and very secondarily the positive behest of Hera accounts for the coming of Iris and Lyssa:-

πρὶν αὖν γὰρ ἄλλους ἐκτελευτᾶσαι πικροῖς,  
τὸ χρεὶν νῦν ἐξέσωθεν.

And Zeus's name is again coupled with Fate:

οὐδ' εἴα πατὴρ  
Ζεὺς νῦν κακῶς δρᾶν.

Supplices

Just as the deus in this play descends in a quiet manner, without much jar to the action, so the expression of destiny





and decree are just to the point of colossalness. They are:  $\chi\rho\acute{\alpha}$  (Theraps's duty in general) v. 1184,  $\chi\rho\epsilon\acute{\omega}$  (the particular duty of Cthreotes) v. 1185,  $\chi\rho\acute{\omega}$  (the result of sacrifice) v. 1186,  $\chi\rho\acute{\alpha}$  (testing of the Epigoni) v. 1219. Near the close of the passage, to emphasize the fixedness of the decree already issued, occurs the phrase  $\kappa\upsilon\acute{\upsilon}\kappa\ \epsilon\acute{\omicron}\ \tau\upsilon\ \acute{\iota}\delta\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ .

### Epiprobolus.

In this piece Cypria is certainly the chief apparent cause of all the griefs. Antenor, her bitter rival, does not hesitate to impute to her repeatedly the blame; but at the same time there is, as it were, a rift in the clouds, enabling us to catch a glimpse, possibly of a subtler, darker power behind Aphrodite's machinations (v. 1436): -

$\epsilon\chi\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \gamma\alpha\rho\ \mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\alpha\ \tau\eta\ \sigma\iota\epsilon\gamma\theta\acute{\alpha}\rho\eta$



And in the same breath Artemis makes mention of that divine Law which controls her and other celestial beings:

ἔπει γὰρ οὐ θεὸς φθιτοῖς ὀπᾶν,

The immediate purpose of Artemis's appearance to Theseus is twice announced, - ἀδφοῖν δὲ σέ σέ (v. 1297), and ὡς ἂν οἰμώξῃς ἡλέων (v. 1314). But why must his soul be grieved? Because he has erred. And why, has he erred? Because he is the victim of deception, immediately contrived by Cypris, less immediately by a priest.

Phigeneia Taurica.

Athena makes known her errand in the third line of her address. It is to stop Theseus from pursuing the fugitive. Why should he stop? The answer lies in the very next verse (vv. 1438-9).



πεπραμένους γὰρ Αἰσάτουσι Δοξίου  
 Σεῦρ' ἢ Ἄλ' ὀφείλου.

Thus ~~more~~ the real and the immediate causes are  
 set side by side.

For the rest, the tone of personal authority  
 is somewhat predominant, but in vv. 1462-3  
 the command to Iphigenia reads:-

οὐδ' ἄντι σφύρας Ἰφιγένεια, κλῆμακας  
 Βραυρωνίας σεῖ τῶδε κληδουκείν βεῖας.

See

v. 1559. The causes for Athena's particular  
 arrival and for the presence of any god are  
 set forth in one verse:

"ἡμῶς δὲ πύμπει 2) τοῖς λόγους ἡμῖν φράσαι.

The idea of destiny, however, looks out again  
 in v. 1582:-

παῖδες γενόμενοι σὺν χρόνῳ πεπρωμένοι





The last note of the address (vv. 1604-5) bids mother and son rejoice, -

ἐκ γὰρ τοῦδ' ἀναψυχὰς πότῳ  
κεῖσάμεν' ἡμῖν πότῳ ἐξαγγέλλομαι.

### Crestes.

Orestes' business is that the combatants shall stop. They are to stop at the inner hear. What there to hear is the message of destiny. This drama returns the most drastic interference of a god, and his forthright speech includes five implications of Fate:-

v. 1635 Concerning Helen:

Ζηνὸς γὰρ ὄσσαν ὤντιν νῦν ἄφθιτον χρεών.

v. 1643 To Crestes:

οὐδ' ἂν χρεών.... and so

on, recounting the religious rites (of purification) through which he must pass.



v. 1652 Of the mother's equity on Argos:-

ἐνθα νικᾷσαι σε χρή.

v. 1654 Of his marriage:

ἦμαί πέπραταί σ' Ἑρμῖόνων.

v. 1656 Of Cleopatra's:

θαυρῶν γὰρ αὐτῇ μοῖρα Δελφικῇ ξίχει.

v. 1674 There, also, moreover, to be a kind of echo in the case of Menelaus, - πείθεσθαι χρεῖν, "obedience is inevitable."

In almost all these interferences, then, there is distinct record, and in all an indication of a far-working Fate (τὸ χρή, τὸ χρεῖν, μοῖρα, τὸ μόριον, πεπρωμένον), which, through the agency of anthropomorphic divinities, lays its iron grasp upon the human puppets, to alter or adjust their course. How the man



anything? It is highly probable. The works of Euripides (as will be shown), teem with references to that blind and awful Power. To a man of his gloomy and austere Temperament such conceptions were bound to appear. The proposed interpretation further deserves a hearing because it is in entire harmony with the spirit of the Hellenic race, from its bright Iomeric youth to its dejected, though ever graceful age in the Anthology. The warrior, the wit, the poet, philosopher, and soldier alike all felt at some period of their lives the Spell of





Fate and Fortune  
in  
Greek Literature.

Terms Employed



Butcher is right in his remark: "A peculiar vein of constitutional sadness belongs to the Greek temperament." (Cf. also *Times* (quoted below) p. 39). A considerable portion of this sadness arises from the thought of man's feebleness in the face of unknown superhuman powers, from the realization of how often the good suffer and the bad escape, from the inevitableness of death and the frequent suddenness of doom. These and similar reflections colored the Greek ideas of fate and fortune, - two closely related forces. The principal notion of the former was, perhaps, fixity; of the latter, mutability. Allégre's exhaustive treatise on ΤΥΧΗ sets the matter in an especially clear light. Many instances now to be presented have been taken from his pages, while others have been independently collected. The same is not a thorough



-17-

presentation, but to show by the citation of passages from representative authors the continuity of feeling on the subject through Greek literature.  
 Homer.

Patroclus (Il. XVI, 849) assigns as the cause of his death first "fateful fate" (μοῖρ' ἰδὸν) which decreed it, second Leto's son who brought about the occasion, third Euphorbus, the immediate agent. In the same breath he speaks of the μοῖρα κραταῖη, which attends Achilles.

Il. XVIII, 117 Achilles says of Hercules:  
ἀλλὰ ἔ μοῖρ' ἐδάμωτο καὶ ἀργαλείος χόλος Ἥρας  
(cf. Herc. Fur. l. c.) and of himself:  
ὥς καὶ ἐγών, εἰ δέ μοι ὁμοίη μοῖρα τέτυκται  
κείσου'.

Il. XIX, 86-7. Agamemnon explaining his former treatment of Achilles





ἐγὼ δ' οὐκ αἰτίος εἰμι  
ἀλλὰ Ζεὺς καὶ μήτηρ καὶ ἡεροφοῖτις ἐρινός.

Il. XXI, 110. From the speech of Achilles, when  
about to despatch Hector.

ἀλλ' ἔτι τοι καὶ ἐμὲ θάνατος καὶ μήτηρ κραταίῃ.  
Hesiod,

In his Theogony, v. 907, Hesiod  
ranks among the children of Themis the well-known  
Three Fates.

Μοῖρας θ' ἧς πλείστον τι μὲν πόρε κατίετα Ζεὺς,  
κλώω τε Λάχεσιν τε καὶ Ἄτροπον, αἵ τε δίδουσι  
ἀνάτοις ἀνθρώποισιν ἔχειν ἄγαθόν τε κακόν τε.

Herodotus. I, 91. This chapter makes one  
of the most definite declarations of the potency  
of Fate, superior even to gods, that can be found  
in all antiquity. The Pythia, defending Apollo  
against the charge of having neglected Croesus,  
says: τὴν πεπρωμένην, μήτηρ ἀδύνατά ἐστι



ἀποφύγειν καὶ θεῶ. \*\*\*\* οὐκ οἶός τε ἐγένετο  
παρὰ Μοῖρας. \*\*\*\* καὶ τοῦτο ἐπιστάτω  
Ἥρως ὡς ὕστερον τοῖσι ἔτεσι τούτοις ἀλὸς  
τῆς πεπρωμένης.

VII, 17 Artabanus makes a test of the  
dream which has been troubling Xerxes (before  
his expedition into Greece), in order to ascertain  
whether it is really heaven-sent. The dream  
appears and tells him: ἀλλ' οὔτε ἐς τὸ μετέ-  
πειτεν οὔτε ἐς τὸ παντὶκα νῦν καταπρόϊσαι  
ἀποτρέπων τὸ χρεὼν γενέσθαι. τὸ χρεὼν is  
obviously the expression of destiny.

Pindar. Ol. II, 39-41 :-

οὕτω δὲ Μοῖρ', ἃ τε πατρώϊον  
τῶνδ' ἔχει τὸν εὐφρονα πόμπαν, θεόρην σὺν ὕδρῳ  
ἐπιτικαὶ πᾶν' ἄρει παλιντρέπελα δάδω χροῖν.

Cf. Schubert's comment: "In Pindar Moira  
is above the gods, just in harmony with her



*Pyth. III, 85-86. Pindar to Hiero:*

λαμέταν γάρ τοι τύραννον δέρκεται,  
εἴ τι ν' ἀνθρώπων, ὃ μέγας πότης.

*Pyth. V, 3 Congratulations to the man  
who brings wealth home πότην παρδόντος.  
Siddons here: "a gift of God, who appears here  
as πότης." (cf. *Pyth. II, 56*).*

*Nem. IV, 43:-*

εὔ οἴδ' ὅτι χρόνος ἔρπον πεπρωμέναν τελέσει.

*ibid., v. 60. Pelon delivered by Cheiron:-*

ἄλαδκε δὲ χεῖρων  
καὶ τὸ μέρσιμον Διόθεν πεπρωμέναν ἔκφερεν.

*Nem. VI, 6-7. We are like the immortals,  
καίπερ ἔφαμεριάν οὐκ εἰδότες οὐδὲ μετὰ νύκτα  
ἄμμε πότης ἄναξ τίν' ἔφαμε δραμεῖν ποτὶ στάθμην.*

*Nem. VII, 1. Elithyia is addressed as*

πάρεδρε Μαιρᾶν βουτυρίαν (cf. *Il. II, 72*).

*Isthm. III, 31ff. Concerning Τύχη:-*





ἔστιν δ' ἀφάρεια τύχας καὶ μαρναμένων  
πρὶν τέλος ἄκρον ἐκέσθαι  
τῶν τε γὰρ καὶ τῶν Σιδῶν.

According to Pausanias, *moreover* (VII, 26, 1), *Pin-*  
da- called Τύχη one of the Fates and more  
powerful, indeed, than her sisters.

Thucydides takes particular occasion to  
introduce and comment on the action of Τύχη  
at various points. Then accuse Fortune, when  
anything happens unexpectedly (παρὰ λόγον), I, 140.  
Fortune causes Athenians and Spartans at  
Aphaktein to exchange roles (IV, 2, 3). In IV,  
62 occurs the significant statement τὸ δὲ ἀ-  
στάτητον τοῦ μέλλοντος ἐστὶ πλεῖστον ἡμεῶν.  
Thucydides again speaks of Fortune (IV, 64). In V, 75, 3 is found the phrase τύχη  
κακίζουσα. The Athenians argue χαλεπὸν πρὸς  
Σύρακιν τε τὴν ὑμετέραν καὶ τὴν τύχην ἀγνοῦσθαι.



(V, 104). III, 67, 1 has the exhortation πρὸς τύχην  
προσμίξωμεν.

Demosthenes in his speech de Corona has  
much to say of the city's Τύχη and of his own. In  
§ 303 he unites τύχης ἰσχύς with συνέμειναι τις,  
κακία τῶν προδιδόντων and στρατηγῶν γαυρότης  
as sources of harm to the state.

Ctesichus (against Telestiphan) says that the  
proper course is not to crown the Bone of Greece,  
but rather τὸν δαίμονα καὶ τὴν τύχην συνπρα-  
κολουθοῦσαν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ γοητίζεσθαι.

Comici Graeci (reference to Herod.).

Philemon (Fr. 31 K.) says of men:

Σοῦδοι βασιδεῦν εἰσὶν, ὁ βασιδεὺς θεῶν  
ὁ θεὸς ἀνάγκης, - almost as clear a  
statement as that of Terentius here.

Menander contains much that is pertinent.  
αἱ ἀνάγκαι (Fr. 155 K.) are one of the three pri-



and causes of all things, Fortune works without reason, without law: no one is certain of anything (Fr. 355 K.). Fortune is full of change, blind and ignorant (Fr. 717a, b. K.). She is hard to please (Fr. 79 K.). To some she gives abundance of ill (Fr. 557 K.). She gives, in overturning, an settled state of affairs (Fr. 590 K.). I thought that she was in accord with reason (Fr. 817 K.). She is capricious (Fr. 855 K.).

Stipparchus (Fr. 2 K.) mentions πόδεσσι and μεταβολὰι τύχης as destructive elements in life.

Phylodorus Tyrastus (Fr. V, 4. K.) enquires:

Ἐπιπτάτεϊ τις τοῦ βίου νυνὶ τύχῃ

ἄσπικτος ἦν; (cf. verses 14 and 26).

Among the Incerti Poetae Comici, too, one fragment (258 K.) declares:

Ἐ΄δωκα καὶ τὰς ὑφ' ἑδους τὰς τὰς τύχας.

Again, all things, are returned; and all men





be expected for men (Fr. 553 K.).

Chew (Fr. 509),

ἡρώααι. Σε πῶδοις τῆς τύχης, Βελτίους.

and Chrysanthus, in Chrys. VI, 263, speaks of Τύχη as μεταφέρων τὰ σώματα.

Phylarchus I, 35 relates a version of fortune, which taught everyone τὸ διαπιστοῦν τῇ τύχῃ.

In I, 86, 7 the Carthaginians had crucified one of the enemy's leaders, and he subsequently turned out to be a general, and there was general rejoicing. The comment made is:

τῆς τύχης ὥσπερ ἐπιτατὲς ἐκ παραθέσως ἀμφοτέρως ἐν ἀλλὰ δὲ δι' αὐτὴς ἀγορεύει εἰς ὑπερβολὴν τῆς κατ' ἀδύνατον τραπίας.

Chrysian, V. A. II, 23, calls Chrysian the favorite of Fortune.

Quintus Smyrnaeus. For a single example see VI, 13. With intention, probably, of Symonides of



The Homers. Menelaus gives over Grecian arms:

ποδέας γὰρ ὑπέκδασε Λαέρτιος Αἴονα.

In C16. 911 occurs the line

οὐδὲ Τύχης σ' ἐδάσσατο πάλιν κλένια τάλλα.

The Palatine Anthology, especially in its Epigrammata Sepulchralia and Exhortatoria, often uses Τύχη or μοῖρα as a motif. Thus, of Euripides (VII, 44) εἰδέσθαι πότμος; the Fates were tears for Tecuba (VII, 99); of Ajax (VII, 141) ὃν κτενε Μοῖρα; Τύχη causes a brave death (VII, 253); Fate destroyed certain soldiers (VII, 255); Fate brushed aside hopes of marriage (VII, 490); the death of Phryas, came ἐκ Μοιρέων (VII, 506); of a fourteen year old (VII, 561) ἀφ' ἧραςε Σαῖων, with the lament Ἄ Μοῖραι, τί τοσοῦτον ἀπηνέες; "the last silence" of Fate (VII, 588); the thread of Fate (VII, 597); mother is led by the Fates (Κῆρες) (VII, 70).

Again we have οὐ δόξον, οὐ νόον οἶδε Τύχην



(X, 62); in X, 64 Fortune is 'Ἰεὺ παῖνος ἑε'; she is the κακοπράττειν βιότιο (X, 65); in X, 66 is mentioned the τέχνη ὀδυστρῆς Τύχης; the life of mortals is a παίγριον Τύχης (X, 80); there is an uncertain stream τῆς ἀναιδέου Τύχης, and "how may one overcome her?" (X, 96); even asses suffer from good or evil Fortune (XI, 313).

Leop. Hare's / Le Destin et la Mort dans la  
Tragédie Grecque essays a discussion and a certain representation of the several Greek words for "Fate." A list of his results will have a direct bearing at this point upon our topic.

Μοῖρα represents originally each man's "part" or lot: it is a mixture of blessings and evils (p. 4), and in its ordinary usage is equivalent to destiny, — the Inevitable (p. 5.)

1. For a number of other similar illustrations of the Greek attitude toward Fate and Fortune, from sources archaeological and literary, see H. Lang, in Reich. f. class. Phil., 1872, pp. 761-7.





*Aïōa* (from *saîw*) is a man's "share" (p. 6). Both *Mōipe* and *Aïōa* when personified become blind, inexorable powers, not signs of human life and action.

'*Aváκκη* is the imperious and terrible Law of necessity, against whom even the gods are powerless (p. 6). *τὸ χρεῖν* and *τὸ χρῆν* have practically the same significance (p. 7).

Two other common words are *εἰς ἀπὸ τοῦ* (connected with *saîpa*) and *μετὰ τοῦ*.

Next is treated the question of the relation of Zeus to these forces (p. 8). Truth to tell, the ideas of the Greeks on this head are in an extremely vague and fluid state, without any approach to dogmatism. Sometimes Zeus is himself subservient to *Mōipe* (cf. Aeschyl. *Prom.* 518); sometimes, as often in Euripides (who perhaps nowhere presents this deity in a stereotyped form) the two



we die; again, it is Zeus who directs Fate (p. 1).

Δέμης, called child of Zeus, is the personification of law and order, physical and moral (p. 1).

Τύχη is pure Chance, indifferent and uncertain (p. 22). Now she is seen ruling even the divine world, now she seems to be subject to the gods (as in the common phrase *Σαίκεος τύχη*). Her fundamental character is instability (p. 24).

Δαίμων, besides its varied uses as "spirit," often becomes equivalent to destiny (p. 25), or better perhaps Providence — this happens when it occurs in the singular without an article; and, as Kauer apparently feels to a line, Deo's unlikeli condition is usually in definite and amounts to "Fate," — that is, some outside, higher power the results of which are not specified!

To the above catalogue I would add Πόταος, that which befalls one; to speak for impression.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Medea 352: *λαμπρὰς θεοῦ*, and Supp. 469.



personification is a rare thing with the term  
then with respect of the other





Fate and Fortune  
in  
Empedocles.



Whether we find a feeling of dependence  
 upon Fate and Fortune cropping out over all the  
 hills and dales of Greek literature, in Euripides  
 it is a hardy plant in full blossom upon  
 fertile soil. What Wilamowitz says (Heracles<sup>2</sup>  
 I, p. 133) of the poet's old age may perhaps be  
 made to cover most of his career: "er sah im  
 Leben nur noch eine Odeur der Dinge. Fur-  
 ther, we encounter very largely a particular side  
 of that feeling. It is the conception, which has  
 already passed before us in glimpses, of the  
Tragedy of Fate. The stroke of doom comes almost  
 always some unusual overthrow: the high are  
 made low, and the low high; what was hoped  
 for is not attained, but instead something  
 never imagined. The unseen power is generally  
 capricious, and spitefully capricious at that.  
 The rejoicer in casting down man's plans and



in making painfully apparent the futility of their effort. There is often a sharp irony of situation somewhat beyond the limits of the well known tragic irony. Even in the language, sometimes, harsh juxtapositions, after the style of oxymoron, produce the same effect. In *Agamemnon* one meets with far less of this fatalism and disappointment. A tentative comparison in that direction will shortly be made.

We may now proceed to review striking instances of the power of Fate in Euripides (many of them including the element of the Unexpected). A familiarity with his general method will create a better understanding of the part which Fate plays in divine interference.

Abundant cases of τύχη must be noted in which the word has remained a common noun and never acquired any notion of





personification. The same exemption applies, as a rule, to the words εἰσρχός, εἰσρχός, εἰσαίωμι, εἰσαίωμι: they do not connote an interested and active Force.

Alcestis.

Apollo says of the heroine ἔμεν Πέπρωται (v. 21). This very death the Fates have been tricked into accepting (Μοῖρας ἰδύσας, v. 12). The expression is, as it were, repeated in v. 27, ἔμεν αὐτὴν χρεών.

Death speaks of Apollo's rescue of Alcestis as Μοῖρας σφ' ἔδρατε (v. 33). The chorus sing (v. 114) μέγας γὰρ ἐπὶ μέγας Πάταρ. The servant mentions the ἡμέρα πεπρωμένη (v. 147). Alcestis (v. 384) cries out to "Providence": ἦ δαίμων, τίς σου δύσιν, μ' ἀνέσπεῖς.

In reference to Alcestis's mission (v. 482) the chorus sing τῇ συνέσει πτόμα. . .



εἴποιτο θεὸς in the wish of Heracles (v. 514). Admetus calls his friend (v. 523) οἶκ' οἷός τε μοῖρας ἔς τυχὲν αἰεὶν χρεὶν; Phaedra approaches Admetus with having excused τὰν περὶ πρῶτον τόχην. No mortal knows whether he shall survive the morrow (vv. 783-4). Outside of the existence of the moment we must call τὰ δ' ἄλλα τῆς τύχης (v. 781). Words of the chorus (v. 888) are: τόχα τόχα δυσπρόδικτος ἔχει.

Admetus utters the phrase (vv. 11-12) μετὰ πένθος δαίμονος. In his grief he abuses his conduct as Phaedra had done: πότμον οὐ χρεὶν εἶναι, παρὲς τὸ νόστον (v. 437). The chorus (in which we have especial right to look for personal opinion of Euripides), has in vv. 765 & this significant statement: κρεῖττον οὐδὲν Ἀνάγκης ἦναι.

Zeus is associated with Ἀνάγκα in vv. 878-9.



From the chorus again (v. 1120): ἐπὶ μὲν οὐκ  
 ἔστιν ἂν εἴ δέποι τύχην. - Chremes at first  
 (v. 1125) regards the resurrection of his wife as  
 κέρτους θεοῦ.

Strobilomache.

Strobilomache to illustrate the  
 uncertain nature of men's lot cites the pro-  
 verb "Call no man happy until he is dead"  
 (v. 100). The advice of the chorus (v. 126) is γνῶθι  
 τύχην. Strobilomache charges her child (v. 414)  
 to remember his mother's sacrifices, ἂν ὑπεκ-  
 οφύλας μόνον. In v. 876 it is Hermione's turn  
 to cry out ἴδμε τί τ' ἐστίν. Orestes speaks of  
 his lot (v. 974) as τὸν παρόντα δαίμον'. Later  
 (iv. 1017-8), bearing vengeance on Klytemnestra, he  
 declares:

ἐχθρῶν γὰρ ἀνδρῶν, μῶτερ εἰς ἀνάστροφον





δαίμων δίδωσι.

Phew calls out on Fate (μοῖρα) when he learns of his grandson's death (v. 1081); it has bestridden him, he says, and holds him down. He vainly wishes (v. 1182-3): εἴθε τ' ὑπ' Ἰλίου ἦνυρ δαίμων Σιμοεντίδα παρ' ἑκτάν,

Bacchae.

The mother of Dionysus bore him, say the chorus (vv. 44-103), ἐνίκα Μοῖραι τέλειαν.

Secuba.

The ghost of Phryxos makes known (v. 73) that ἡ πεπρωμένη is preparing death on that day for Phryxena.

Talthyrius, beholding Secuba's fallen state (v. 771), wonders if Τύχη can really rule all human affairs. His entire speech of a dozen lines dilates on the fickleness of human happiness.



Smitten by a new disaster the royal lady laments Polydorus (vv. 695-6):

τίνι μέρω ἀνέσκεις;  
τίνι πόντῳ κείσθαι;

Respecting the same event Agamemnon enquires (v. 773): τίς ποταυὸν τέχεν; . Impressed by her misfortune the King wonders if any woman were ever so unhappy (δυστυχής), to which Tecuba replies, with almost a pun (v. 786):

οὐκ ἔστιν, εἰ μὴ τὴν τέχην αὐτὴν λέγεις.

"No man is free", declares Tecuba (v. 803); even one is a slave either of Wealth or of Τύχη.

The last words of the play are: στερρὴ γὰρ ἀνάγκη.

### Notes

The chorus sympathetic with Helen (vv. 211-12), lamenting: ὦ δαίμονοι τοῦδε πόσι / νόσφας τε δᾶς, γόναί. Helen herself later asks



τίνι πύτῳ συνεδύην;

Menelaus (v. 412) regards his rescue from shipwreck as effected by Τύχη. As a proverb he quotes (v. 514): Σεινὸς ἀνάγκης οὐδὲν ἰσχύει πλεόν. — The false Image of Helen in her farewell address says that she remained ὅσον μ' ἔχρην) τὸ νόστιμον σῶμα (v. 612-13). In v. 663 Menelaus speaks of the workings of destiny as δῶρα δαιμόνων. Presently he asks (v. 669): τίς τε δαίμων ἢ Πύτμος οὐδ' αὖ πάτρας; "From my home," Helen answers (v. 695), θεὸς ἔβαλεν ἐμέ.

The Messenger is impressed by the strange quips of Fortune. Providence appears to him ποικίλον τε καὶ δυστέκμαρτον, its function ἀναστρέφειν ἐκείσθ' ἀκεῖσθ'. He cites an example, and concludes: βεβαίον οἶδ' ἐν τῇσ' αἰεὶ τύχαις ἔχειν (v. 711-15). — The fall of Priam





as to *Ἰακρινία* *πύκνιν*. — Concerning Men-  
elaus Theoclymenus *ἴσιν* (v. 1286) *ἔχει πύκνιν*.  
[v. 1318 deserves attention, but the text at this  
point is in an unsatisfactory condition.]  
Regarding the presence of Helen the Egyptian  
King asserts (v. 1636): *ἄλλ' ἔδωκεν ἡ τύχη μοι*.  
The chorus respond: *τὸ δὲ χρεῖον ἰσχυρότερον*.

### Electra.

The chorus (v. 403) are encouraged  
to think that *ἡ τύχη σταίη ἄν καλῶς*.

Both the chorus and the old attendant re-  
cognize *Τύχη* (which seems here almost, if not  
quite personified) to be an important element  
in the project of Orestes (vv. 544 and 610).

Orestes assures his sister respecting the  
murder of Clytemnestra (v. 648): *ἐκείνῃ γ' ἡ  
τύχη θύοι καλῶς*. — In v. 892 the gods are  
allied with *Τύχη*; Orestes will assist them.



The chorus in vv. 1100-01 advert to the ironical turns of fortune; but these lines are doubted by Mauck. In vv. 1147-8 they comment on the ἀνομβία and μετέστροφος αἴψα which are already received. In their final song (vv. 1357-9) they aver that any mortal is happy who labors not under some stroke of fortune (ἐκτύχη).

### Heracleidae.

Demophon, coming on the scene (v. 122) asks τίς Τύχη has collected the thing.

In the case of the Heracleidae nobility is ~~re~~ conquered by Τύχη (v. 233).

The choral song from v. 608 to v. 617 reflects on the inconstancy of all things, and Fate's part in that upheaval. No man is unchangingly happy or unfortunate, nor for the



some house continuously rejoice in prosperity;

παρὰ δ' ἄλλαν ἄλλα

μοῖρα διώκει.

τὸν μὲν ἄφ' ὑψηλῶν βραχὺν ἔκτισε,

τὸν δ' ἀτίταν εὐδαίμονα τύχει.

μύριον δ' οὔτε φερεῖν θέμις,

οὐ σοφία τις ἀπώσεται.

Since now the changes are mine (vv. 865-6)

on σκοπέειν τὴν τελευτὴν, and the reason  
given is ὡς ἐφύμεροι τύχαι.

The chorus, too, agree (vv. 848-9): πολλὰ  
γὰρ τίκτει Μοῖρα τελεσιδότης?

For announcing Eurystheus (vv. 834-5)  
τὴν ἐναντίαν / δαίμων ἔθηκε καὶ μετέστη-  
σεν τύχην, he directs (v. 1030) that he be  
buried οὗ τὸ μύριον.

Terrible Furies.





Megara seems that mortal σκαῖός (v. 283) who struggles against τῷ ἀναγκαίῳ τρόπῳ. Similar is her sentiment in vv. 204-10:-

τὰς τῶν θεῶν γὰρ ὅστις ἐκκοχθεῖν τύχας  
πρόθυμός ἐστιν, ἡ προθυμία δ' ἄφρων.

Of herself she says (vv. 280-1):

μεταβαλὺσα ἡ τύχη  
νόμφας μὲν οὐκ ἄνθρωπος ἀντίδωκ' ἔχειν.

As for σκαῖός, Fortune has snatched him away (v. 507), as an eagle might bear its prey on high.

When Lycus is about to meet his doom (vv. 735 and 737), the chorus sing of μεταβαλεῖν κικλῶν and celebrate the σταδύπρους πόδας θεῶν.

Of course the great reversal of fortune in the plot itself, occasioned by the advent of Lycus, should be noted. This will be



treated later. Regarding the event the chorus  
thus expresses themselves (v. 855): τὰχὺ τὸν εὐ-  
τυχὴν μετέβαλεν δαίμων.

Theseus tells Pericles (v. 1314) that no  
mortal is τὰς τύχας ἀκράτους, nor are the  
gods exempt; if the latter must endure  
such things, why need he γέρειν ὑπέρπευ  
τὰς τύχας (v. 1321)? The hero accordingly  
concludes at last (v. 1357): τῇ τύχῃ δοῦναι-  
τέον.

### Supplices.

Aethra believes (v. 331) that  
ὁ θεὸς πάντ' ἀνασπρέγει πᾶν. - To the laws  
of evil sometimes δαίμων δίδωτ' καὶ δαῖς (v. 463).

Theseus declares (vv. 550-1), that good for-  
tune is never constant and τυχεῖ ὁ δαίμων.  
The man in ill-luck honors this spirit  
to gain his good will, the prosperous man



to maintain it.

Μοῖρα, say the chorus (vv. 608-9) may  
strike on the man of distinguished circum-  
stances. It is the gods who may assign to  
mortals κακῶν ἀναψυχάς (vv. 615-16).

Death with friends is a pleasant thing,  
εἰ δαίμων τόδε κράνει (v. 1008). — Evadne  
utter the words (vv. 1013-14) τύχα δέ μοι  
βυβάπτει πῶδός.

Hippolytus.

Phaedra relating her own  
experience (v. 241): ἔπειτα δαίμονος ἄτα.  
Even the nurse in v. 360 seems to imagine a  
greater power behind Cypria. Phaedra lies  
out upon the κακοτυχεῖς γυναῖκων πότασι (vv.  
668-9). She commits suicide "in awe of  
her stern fate" (δαίμονα στυγρὰν καταιδεσ-  
θεῖσα), v. 772.





Theseus accuses Τύχη (v. 818) of having overwhelmed the house. A little further (v. 832) he speaks of the τύχη Σικελίων which has come upon him. — The chorus, on the discovery of Phaedra's tablet (vv. 867-8) lament: τόδ' αὖ νεοχρὸν ἐκδοχαῖς ἐπιφέρει θεὸς κακόν. — In v. 1080 is a different expression of Fate. Hippolytus says of his lot: ἄραρον.

Still another choral song occurs (vv. 1108-10) on the subject of change in all mortal things:

ἄλλα γὰρ ἄλλοθεν ἀμείβεται  
μετὰ δ' ἴστανται ἀνδράσιν αἰὼν  
πολυπλάνυτος αἰεὶ.

The chorus pray that αἰῶνα θεῶν may use them kindly (vv. 1111-12). When news arrives of the fatal accident to Hippolytus,



they know that a new συμφορὰ κέκρυπται,  
and add: οὐδ' ἔστι νείκεας τοῦ χρεών τ'  
ἁπτάδην (vv. 1255-6).

Theseus intends to convict his son of  
falsehood by ταυόων συμφορὰς (v. 1267).

Iphigenia Chalcidensis.

Agamemnon  
to Menelaus (v. 390): θεοῦ σοι τὴν τύχην δι-  
δόντος εἶ.

In v. 441 (a doubtful passage) we meet a faith  
that all will be well, ἰούσας τῆς τύχης.

Just beyond Agamemnon describes him-  
self as fallen εἰς ἀνάγκης δεύματα' (v. 444), and  
explains further (v. 445) by ὕπνῳ τε ταύων.  
His expression is similar in v. 511. He has  
come εἰς ἀναγκαίαν τύχην.

The old slave admits (v. 858) that he cannot  
give himself airs with αἰχίλλης, ὅτι τὸν



γὰρ οἶκ' ἐγὼ. He appeals in v. 864 to Τύχη to protect those in whom he is interested.

Agamemnon in the first shock of horror at ascertaining Clytemnestra's project (v. 878):

τίς αὐτὸν οὐπαμὲν ἀλαστόρων;

Soon after comes the question (v. 882):

εἰς ἅρ' Ἰφιδένειαν Ἐλένας νόστος ἦν πεποιημένος;

Agamemnon, at the point where his secret has been discovered, cries out (v. 1136):

ὦ πῖνυα μήτρα καὶ τύχη δαίμων τ' ἐμὸς.

From Iphigenia's lament (vv. 1331-2):-

τὸ χρεὼν δέ τι δύσποτον  
ἀνδράσιν ἀνερπεῖν.

The chorus agree (v. 1404) that Achilles has done well, but τὸ τῆς τύχης νοσεῖ.

μήτρα ἐκ θεῶν is mentioned in v. 1605.

Iphigenia Taurica.

Iphigenia, lamenting her brother's supposed





death (v. 156), means  $\tau\omega\ \tau\omega\ \lambda\alpha\iota\omega\nu$ .

The chorus addressing Iphigenia (v. 202):  $\sigma\pi\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\iota\ \epsilon\pi\iota\ \sigma\omicron\iota\ \lambda\alpha\iota\omega\nu$ . She replies:  $\epsilon\varsigma\ \upsilon\pi\chi\alpha\varsigma\ \mu\omicron\iota\ \delta\upsilon\sigma\lambda\alpha\iota\omega\nu\ \lambda\alpha\iota\omega\nu$  (v. 203), and  $\sigma\tau\epsilon\pi\pi\alpha\nu\ \pi\alpha\iota\delta\epsilon\iota\alpha\nu\ \mu\omicron\iota\theta\upsilon\sigma\alpha\iota\ \sigma\upsilon\nu\tau\epsilon\iota\nu\omicron\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\nu\ \theta\epsilon\alpha\iota$  (v. 206-7).

No man knows his ultimate destiny (v. 478):  $\eta\ \gamma\alpha\rho\ \tau\acute{\upsilon}\chi\eta\ \pi\alpha\rho\acute{\eta}\gamma\alpha\gamma'\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\ \delta\upsilon\sigma\mu\alpha\theta\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$ .

The opinion of Orestes is (v. 484):  $\tau\acute{\upsilon}\chi\eta\nu\ \delta'\ \epsilon\acute{\alpha}\nu\ \chi\rho\epsilon\acute{\omega}\nu$ . "Unfortunate!", he goes on to say, "would be our proper name". But the priestess of Iphigenia answers (v. 501):  $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\ \mu\epsilon\nu\ \delta\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\tau\ \tau\acute{\upsilon}\chi\eta$ .

Pylades, seeking to justify Apollo (v. 721-2):  $\acute{\alpha}\delta\delta'\ \epsilon\omicron\tau\epsilon\nu\ \epsilon\omicron\tau\epsilon\nu\ \eta\ \delta\iota\alpha\nu\ \delta\upsilon\sigma\pi\rho\alpha\varsigma\iota\alpha\ \delta\iota\alpha\nu\ \delta\iota\ \delta\omicron\upsilon\sigma\alpha\ \mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\beta\omicron\delta\acute{\alpha}\varsigma,\ \omicron\tau\alpha\nu\ \tau\acute{\upsilon}\chi\eta$ .

Iphigenia gives for her father's death (v. 864):  $\acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\rho\alpha\ \pi\acute{\omicron}\tau\mu\omicron\nu\ \epsilon\lambda\alpha\chi\epsilon\nu$ .

Orestes even expresses a kind of confidence



in unstable Τύχη (vv. 407-10): τῇ τύχῃ δ' οὐδὲ  
μέλει τοῦδε εἴν' ἡμῖν,

Ion.

Themes of the prologue steps aside  
into a thick τὸ κρυπτόν ὡς ἂν ἐκρύβω παῖδός  
πέρη.

Ion desires either that he may serve Thebes  
freely, ἢ παυσαίαν ἀγαθῇ μέρῃ (v. 152). — He  
fears that Xuthus is mad (v. 520), and enquires:  
ἢ σ' ἔμνε θεοῦ τις, ὦ ξένε, βλάβη; Of the  
manner of Ion's berating Xuthus says (v. 554):  
ὁ πόταρ ἐξ ἡῶρεν, τέκνον. The lad's early exist-  
ence is described at v. 1269: ἐσθλὸν ἔκρυπα  
δαίμονος. He frequently (v. 1374) he says: — [τῇ]  
τοῦ δαίμονος (contrasted with τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ) φύσιν.  
Yet he is obliged to admit (v. 1388): τῇ γὰρ πε-  
πραμέν' εἰς ἕπερβαίνεν ποτ' ἄν. When the dis-  
covery of identity is on the point of being made, he



exclaims (v. 1422):

ὦ Ζεῦ, τίς ἡμᾶς ἐκκυναγεῖται πότμος;

His address to Τύχη (v. 1512) is in line with Euripides' regular conception:

ὦ μεταβαλόνσα κυρίους ἤδη βροτῶν  
καὶ δυστοχῆσαι καὐθις αὖ πράξαι καθῶς,  
τύχη, κτῆ.

Ulysses.

Ulysses, having heard the story of Laertes, interjects (v. 110) Παππᾶ· τὸν αὐτὸν Σαίμον' ἐξανδρῆς ἐμὸν. — Ulysses feels that if he should fail of his project (vv. 606-7),

τὴν τύχην αὖν Σαίμον' ἡγεῖσθαι, χρεὼν,  
τὰ Σαίμονος δὲ τῆς τύχης ἐλάσσονα.

Medea.

The nurse brings forward (v. 140 ff.) the ironical situation that whereas songs, have long served for amusement, no one has ever yet





managed by such means to assuage grief and pain, from the time that *τεῖναι τέχαι σφάδδονοι* *Σόων* (v. 198), - *Zeus* has plunged *Medea* (v. 362) *εἰς ἄπυρον κλύδωνν*. - *Jason* desires not gold nor song (v. 544), *εἰ μὴ 'πίσχυος ἡ τέχνη γένυτό μοι*. - *Creon* is childless (v. 671) *δαίμονός τινος τέχνη*.

*Medea* says of the *prince* (v. 966): *κεῖνας ὁ δαίμων* (*Fate* is on her side). She speaks of her reason (v. 1064) as something *fatal*: *πάντες πέπρωται τὰντα κούκ' ἐκφεύξεταί*.

The *chorus* lecture the *children* doomed (v. 1109-10), *εἰ δὲ νυμφότες ταύων εἴη*. Again they *wail* (v. 1231-2): *εἴη' ὁ δαίμων πῶδ' ἂν κακὴ βρᾶπτειν Ἰάσονι*. - *Jason* at v. 1347 can say nothing for *Jason*.

### Chorus.

*Electra* expects death, and the *chorus*



(v. 19) agree:  $\eta\delta\delta\alpha\iota\delta\alpha\varsigma\ \tilde{\alpha}\rho'\ \epsilon\ \theta\epsilon\tau\alpha\upsilon\varsigma$ . There is nothing lasting ( $\alpha\iota\omega\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ ), they say, in good fortune (v. 340 ff.):

$\tilde{\alpha}\rho\alpha\ \delta\epsilon\ \lambda\alpha\iota\phi\alpha\varsigma\ \tilde{\alpha}\varsigma$

$\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \tilde{\alpha}\kappa\alpha\iota\alpha\upsilon\ \theta\epsilon\alpha\varsigma\ \tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\alpha\varsigma\ \lambda\alpha\iota\phi\iota\alpha\upsilon\ \kappa\alpha\iota$ .

Orestes on his own fortune (v. 384):  $\delta\ \lambda\alpha\iota\phi\iota\alpha\upsilon\ \delta'\ \epsilon\tilde{\iota}\varsigma\ \mu\epsilon\ \pi\alpha\upsilon\sigma\iota\alpha\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\kappa\tilde{\iota}\alpha\upsilon$ . — Fortune is sufficient without friends,  $\delta\tau\alpha\upsilon\ \epsilon\tilde{\iota}\ \delta\iota\delta\tilde{\omega}$  (v. 667-8). —  $\delta\ \theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$  in v. 100 seems to be used indefinitely of "the higher powers,"  $\mu\epsilon\sigma\sigma\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\ \gamma\alpha\rho\ \tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \tilde{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\upsilon\ \pi\alpha\theta\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\iota\varsigma$  is the immediate context.

$\delta\ \tau\tau\epsilon\rho\beta\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \tau\alpha\ \kappa\alpha\tau\theta\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\nu\tau'$ ; is Orestes's impatient cry to Electra in v. 1023: and the following verse, though bracketed by Sturz, suits very well its surroundings:  $\theta\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\nu\ \tilde{\alpha}\nu\alpha\gamma\kappa\epsilon\ \tau\alpha\varsigma\ \pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\alpha\varsigma\ \tau\acute{\omicron}\lambda\alpha\varsigma$ . — Electra in turn calls for Orestes  $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\delta\epsilon\alpha\varsigma\ \pi\acute{\omicron}\tau\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\upsilon$  (v. 1029). To Terence she reports the popular dance (v. 1330):  $\Sigma\phi\alpha\gamma\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\varsigma$



ἀνάγκης εἰς θυγὸν καθέστανεν.

At the close of the action the chorus ex-  
claims against Τύχη (v. 1537): ἰὼ ἰὼ Τύχα. — The  
authority of this blind force is expressed in vv.  
1545-6:—

τέδος ἔχει δαίμων βροτῶν  
τέδος ὅππᾳ θέλει.

Teukros.

Teukros urges the chorus (vv. 101-2):  
μεταφιδδωμένον δαίμονος ἰστέχου, and πλεῖ κατὰ  
δαίμονα, and again (v. 104) to avoid resistance  
πλέοντα τύχαισιν. — From a choral ode (v. 204):  
ἔρρει νῦν αὖτα καὶ δαίμων.

If Teukros's daughter Polydora announces  
(v. 270): ἔχει πότις νιν. — Cassandra speaks  
(v. 340) of τὸν πεπρωμένον πότιν. — Teukros to  
Andromache (v. 616): τὸ τῆς ἀνάγκης φεινόν.

The former in vv. 1008-9 says that Helen, all this





τύχην ἰπῶτα, practical how she might follow  
 on her way. — The Trojan Chorus, like others,  
 see (vv. 1118-19) καὶ νῦν καὶ νῦν μεταβάλλουσιν  
 χθονὶ συντυχίαι. — Hector's father (vv. 1200-01):  
 οὐ γὰρ εἰς κάλλος Σείων δίδωσιν, whoever  
 counts on a continuation of happiness is a fool  
 (vv. 1203-04). αἱ τύχαι ἄλλοτ' ἄλλοτε πινύσκει.  
 In her own case (vv. 1242-3), ἡμῶς θεὸς ἔ-  
 στρεψε τῶν περὶ βίαν κάτω χθονός.

Phoenissae.

Oedipus is described (v. 66) as  
 πρὸς τῆς τύχης νοστῶν. — One of the alternative  
 causes for Orestes's fate is put thus (v. 352):  
 εἴτε τὸ θαμνίων κατεκώμασε δώμασιν. — Poly-  
 nices tells his mother (v. 813): ὁ Σείων μ' ἐνείκεσσι  
 πρὸς τὴν τύχην. — In the interview of Orestes  
 with Helen, the latter is said (v. 914) to sum-  
mon τὴν τύχην by his insistence. *Phoenissae* (v. 1000)



she tried to avoid him (φεύγειν). The two alternatives offered to Creon are called (v. 751) δουρ ποταμῶν.

Those whose destiny has not been pronounced by oracles are spoken of (v. 1000) as οὐκ εἰς ἀνάγκην λαχόντων ἀσπίδα. — Λαχόντων τις ἴτα, the chance one (v. 1066), has fallen on the mind of Thebes. — Fortuna (τὰ τῆς τύχης) is mentioned (v. 1252) as equally beneficent with the gods (τὰ τῶν θεῶν).

Oedipus enquires of Antigone (v. 1566): τίς μοι Τροάστ' ἐπέσχετο. — He is led to exclaim (v. 1585): ὦ μοῖρ, ἵπ' ἀρχῆς ὥς α' ἐφύσας ἄθλιον. — Creon in his altercation with Antigone (v. 1662): ἔκριν' ὁ Λαῖών, Παρθέν', οὐχ ἔσθ' ἰδοκεῖ. — Oedipus to Antigone (v. 1687): πρὸν ὅσον αἰ μῦθ' ἀκρίτως ἔειπες.

Fragments



F. 37 (Chorus). He is they, who best  
endures τὰς δαμνῶν τύχας.

F. 148 (Andromeda). A man is commiserated  
because to him τὰς τύχας οὐκ ἂν ὁθευεῖς ἔδωχ'  
ὁ δαμνῶν.

F. 149 (Andromeda). No mortal was ever  
successful without the coöperation of τὸ θεῶν  
οὐ.

F. 151 (Chorus). Fate works still by  
surprises. τὸ δαμνῶν οὐκ ἴσῃς  
ὅτι μῶρα διεξέρχεται;  
στρέψει δ' ἄλλους ἄλλως εἰς ἀμείραν.

F. 152 (Andromeda). Life and fortune  
remain uncertain

νεύει βίος, νεύει δὲ τύχα  
κατὰ πνεῦν' ἀέμενον.

F. 210 (Antigone). Griefs as well as joys  
are changeable.





βροτείων πημάτων ὅσαι τέχαι  
ὅσαι τε μορφαί.

F. 257 (Archelaus). Δίκη figures as a kind of deus ex machina. She is near, and invisible overall. At an unexpected moment she appears to punish.

F. 273 (Aragé). Again it is said: τῆς  
τέχης οὐκ εἰς τρόπον.

F. 275 (Aragé). For all men at some  
time δαίμων βίην ἐσφunde, καὶ δεῖς διὰ τέχης  
ἐνδαιμονεῖ.

F. 306 (Bellarophon). et similar except.

τέχας δὲ ἀνθρώπων  
τὸ μὲν μέν' εἰς νότον ὁ πόδ' ἔχοντος χρόνος  
μεθόστος, τὸ δὲ μεῖον αὔξων.

F. 371 (Eurythmus Satyrus). The speaker is  
in a quandary, finding τέχνη superior to  
rules and laws.



οὐκ οἶδ' ὅτε κρὴ παύει τὰς βροτῶν τιχας  
ἔρως ἄβρησαν· εἰδέναι τὸ δραστήον.

F. 447 (Hippolytus). An invocation, - ὦ  
Jaïmon.

F. 478 (Lycamnius), a strong expression.

τὸ τῆς ἀνάγκης οὐ λέγειν ὅσον θυγόν.

F. 507 (Melanippe Captiva). Mortals must  
bear τὰ τυχεράντα.

F. 534 (Meleager). The power of Τύχη.

ὅπως τὸ νῦν δὴ μ' ὥς ἐσπείνας, Τύχη.

F. 546 (Meleager). The fleetingness of  
presently:-

ἤδη, τὰ τῶν εὐδαιμονούντων ὡς ταχὺ σιγί-  
φει θεός.

F. 556 (Oedipus). Here the changes are  
directly ascribed to Fate.

πυδδὰς γ' ὁ Jaïμων τοῦ βίου μεταστάσεις  
ἔδωκεν ἡμῶν μεταβολὰς τε τῆς τύχης



F. 611 (Pericles). Τύχη is the ally of  
οἱ εὖ φρονούντες.

F. 621 (Pelus). Prosperity is naught, for  
γ' ἐξ αἰείας ῥῆον ἢ γραψὴν θεός.

F. 664 (Themistocles). Πόνος contains no  
pain ἀνεν Τύχης.

F. 685 (Gyrius). The fortunes of men  
are well called ἀνώνυμοι. Examples are given.

F. 724 (Telephus). Εἴκ' ἀνάγκη. For,

τά τοι μέγιστα ποδδάκεις θεὸς  
ταπείν' ἐθήκε καὶ συνέστειλεν πάλιν.

F. 775 (Phaenon). Note the phrase (v. 43):  
εἰ δὲ τύχα τι τέκε.

F. 787 (Philochorus). The speaker through  
fear of some συντυχία exclaims: πέσαιτε,  
ὦ βιοτά.

F. 841 (Enactum). The ways of Providence  
are past finding out:





ἡ ῥοδὴ καὶ ὁ ῥωστὸς πορεύει θεός.

F. 164 (Incertain). Here θεός and τύχη apparently are related as greater and less:

τῶν ἄνδρ' ἅπ' ἀπτεται

θεός, τὰ μικρὰ δ' εἰς τύχην ἀφείς ἐστί.

F. 1027 (Incertain). Expect the speedy downfall of one whose excruciating manner you see in μεῖδω τῆς τύχης.

F. 1035 (Incertain). Nothing in the world is ἴσον. Fate ought not to lie, as it does, in Τύχαι αἰ μάταια πλανήσεναι.

F. 1058 (Incertain). The same persons do not constantly remain ὀρθοὶ ἐν τύχαις, nor have τὸν αἰὲν θαύμαζ' εἰς αὐτοί. Those who expect it receive ἔσχατον τῆς τύχης ἐν τῇ παθεῖν.

F. 1061 στερρεῖν μῦθον is lost. Many desiring the impossible have lost them.



present good.



Strong in Euripides:

- a) of General Human Experience,
- b) of Hope and Expectation,
- c) of Language.

Brief Comparison

7

Fate and Hope

in  
Sophocles





Fate, then, is not a negligible quantity in Euripides, and we need not be surprised to find even the gods carrying out its behests. Its contrary workings have been seen in numerous examples, and that the poet should present this side of it more than (as he certainly does) in the proclamations of the dei ex machina will appear more natural after observing to a certain extent the numberless contradictions, disappointments, and ironical changes of fortune that occur in the lives of his characters, together with reflections which are put into their mouths. It will only be feasible here to select the more salient contrasts; there are many. Thus, sometimes, firmly in the old (classic) belief, which yet form an integral part of the great tragic world in which they are set.



a) Irony of General Human Experience.

Andromacha.

Paris brought to Helen (v. 103)

οὐ γὰρ οὐκ ἄδδ' αὖτις ἄταν.

Legitimate children are contrasted with illegitimate (vv. 636-8). Helen to themselves:

Ποδάρις δέ τοι

ἔσπ' βαθεῖαν γῆν ἐνίκησε σπυρᾶ,  
νόθος τε ποδοῖ γυναικῶν ἀμείνορος.

The general has the glow; the common soldier the toil (vv. 686-8). Spoken by Helen:-

ἄδδ' ὁ στρατηγὸς τὴν δόκμον ἀρνύει,  
ὅς εἰς αὖτ' ἄδδ' ἀρνύει ποδοῖ δόμον,  
οὐδ' ἔν περ δόμον ἐνὸς ἔχει ποδοῖ δόμον.

In vv. 1400-73 the sharp sequence of events creates a distinct impression of irony, by a manifestation of man's fallibility. Helen bids some one repair to Delphi to prevent his grandson's death; but the words are no



some uttered than a messenger enters to announce that the young man is slain already.

Bacchae.

v. 337 ff. Irony in the fate of Actaeon who, boasting himself a greater hunter than Artemis, was destroyed by his own dogs.

Vv. 397-9. Reflection of the Chorus:

Βραχὺς αἰὼν ἔτι τοῦτο  
 τίς τις ἂν μερῶτα διώκων  
 τὰ ἴασιόντ' οὐκ ἔειποι.

v. 955, 960, 964 and 1255-6 are close to the well-known "tragic" irony, and may be dismissed with a word. In each the sentence carries a hidden sarcasm.

Hecuba.

Vv. 280-1. Hecuba pleads for the life of Polyxena, who remains from her property.





as  $\tau\alpha\rho\alpha\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ ,  $\pi\acute{o}\delta\iota\varsigma$ ,  $\tau\epsilon\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta$ ,  $\beta\acute{\alpha}\kappa\tau\eta\varsigma$ ,  $\eta\gamma\epsilon\upsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\acute{\iota}\delta\acute{\iota}\nu$ . Let this she gets is taken from her. — The queen (v. 592 ff.) speaks of the weather in prosperity and the excellent in adversity, — another image of circumstance. Compare with this v. 618-22 in which she calls to mind Priam's former high estate and her own present wretchedness.

Polynektor in his hypocritical commiseration (vv. 956-60) says that nothing is sure ( $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\nu$ ), — neither fortune nor prosperity. He bids  $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\upsilon\sigma\iota\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha\ \tau\alpha\rho\alpha\psi\acute{o}\nu\ \epsilon\upsilon\tau\iota\beta\epsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ . Then he has followed, Tecuba to eat his greed with still more money, the chorus (vv. 1134-34) expect that instead of benefit, as he hopes, doom may in an unexpected moment befall him. This immediately follows piece.



Euclypsus.

As there is change here below,  
so the gods, too, change their attitudes.  
Tera, ill-disposed to Helen before, is now  
willing to further her departure; Egeus,  
formerly a friend, is now opposed (vv. 777-80).  
Euclypsus.

A variation of the old proverb  
occurs with ironical force in vv. 753-6. A  
villain may think he has won success  
because he runs the first race well, but  
security is not his until he finishes  
life's contest.

Heracleidae.

In v. 427 ff. Telemachus, al-  
most in despair, feels that his efforts are  
about to be shipwrecked. Later, however, he  
again attains security. The uncertainty



exists in the plot.

There is very likely a bit of irony in the idea of fighting being done by old women (v. 680 ff.). This confidence (v. 687) seems ridiculous, the apprehension of his kin well founded. But when the report of the battle comes in, the plot is on the other leg. This piece in their turn appear ridiculous for having ever doubted that anything might take place, and especially anything contrary to expectation. Such seems to be the curious lesson taught.

Proculus Furvus.

To Amphitryo the troubles of mortals are but one phase of eternal change (v. 101 ff.). Things have not always the same force, ἐξίσταται γὰρ πᾶσι  
ἀπ' ἀδιότου Σίχα. There occurs also an apparently foreign line: οἱ τ' ἐντοξαίνονται δὴ





ἰέδωρ δὲ καὶ εὐτοχεύς.

Supplices.

Theseus points out that not even insurance preserves a man from harm, if he allows the guilty to come in contact with him (vv. 226-8).

This chorus, like others, assert (v. 270) that no person is constant. Again (v. 778) the general view of life is briefly summed up: τὰ μὲν εἶ, τὰ δὲ δυστοχεύει. Essentially life is fated δυστοχεύει (v. 860); it is πῶτα τὰ δ' ὠρεῖ τις νεφέλα.

Theseus is disappointed of his expectations (v. 1087 ff); the good which others have in children, he might not attain.

Hippolytus.

Tragedy makes itself clear at the end of Aphrodite's young speech (vv. 56-7)





Triglyphus, in the midst of his prayer, has not known that the gates of Hades were for him that very day. — Soon after it appears again in the youth's ardent aspiration (v. 87): τέδος δὲ κάμψαι' ὥσπερ ἡρῶναι βίου.

Thucida is hard to please. The irony of the situation is seen (vv. 185-6) by: οὐδέ σ' ἀπέσκει τὸ παρόν, τὸ δ' ἀπὲν γέμερον ἔχει.

The irony of the marriage relation is brought out by Triglyphus in v. 625 ff. The father of the bride provides a dowry to be rid of the pest; the bridegroom receives ~~not~~ expecting joy, but destined to be bitterly disappointed.

Thucis's proposition in v. 825 ff. that mankind must have two voices, — for falsehood and for truth, — emphasizes the irony.



of assurance of friendship, - the likelihood of  
failure of one's expectation.

The Chorus (vv. 881-2) lose all faith in  
human happiness: their reason is the con-  
spired murder of events, - τὰ πρὸς ἡμᾶς  
ἀνέστραπται θεῶν.

There is strong irony in the final re-  
velations of father and son. The former,  
seeming just, is unjust; the latter, seeming  
a criminal, is innocent. Cf. πρὸς τὰ in v.  
1320 (echoed by πρὸς τὴν, v. 1321?) of the writing  
on the tablet, which leads Theseus to an  
overbearing rejection of divination, soon re-  
versely punished (v. 1321); also the hesitating  
decision of Hippolytus that intervene by  
breaking his oath could be clear himself.  
Let so strong a case as this is presently  
shattered into bits.



Epigenia Atalidenis.

Agamemnon says

of high rank and position (v. 21): τοῦτο δ' ἔστι  
ἐστὶν τὸ καλὸν ὁ πόσιον.

Very much further on (vv. 161-3) there is a  
reference to the familiar thought that no  
man is constantly fortunate or free from pain.

For a considerable passage of "tragic" irony.  
cf. v. 645 ff. (and v. 733).

vv. 1325 ff. the opposing wind at Atalidis is  
described:-

αἶπρον ἔδδ' οἷς ἔδδ' αὖτ' ἀνέμων  
καίθεοι καίρου,  
τοῖσι δὲ λύπην, τοῖσι δ' ἀνάγκην,  
τοῖς δ' ἔξορμῶν, τοῖς δὲ στέλλειν,  
τοῖσι δὲ μέλλειν.

vv. 1405 Achilles may wish in vain that  
the pretence might become reality.





Ἀφαιεύοντες παῖτ', ἀνδρείον μὲ τις βέβη  
ἔμελλε θάσσειν, εἰ τύχοιμι σῶν γάμων.

v. 1450 Finister line of the tragic sort from  
Clytaemnestra.

Ephigenia Laurica.

vv. 473-5 The chorus,  
not yet knowing the identity of the captives,  
speculate upon the existence of a sister, who  
at their death will be left brotherless.

v. 5+3 Ephigenia, striving to enquire  
for her father in some disguised fashion,  
hits upon the most implicit expression:  
ὄν λέγουσ' εὐδαιμονέων.

vv. 1121-2 By the chorus:

τὸ δὲ μετ' εὐτυχίαν κακοῦ-  
σθαι θνατοῖς βαρὺς αἰών

Strong bordering closely on the tragic is seen in  
v. 1195 (cf. v. 1221).



The confidence of Theseus in vv. 1315-6 meets with disappointment. Poseidon (v. 1415) is ἐραρίας. Theseus is a very short time (cf. v. 1444). In hunting down the runaway the king expects to set over τῶν θεῶν (v. 1425); the dénouement shows how much he was mistaken.

Ion.

Evasion amounting to irony lies in Creusa's words at v. 306.

The Chorus (vv. 381-3) comment on the uncertain nature of man's existence:

πῶδαί γε πῶδαίς εἰσι συμφοραὶ βροτῶν  
καρφαὶ δὲ διαρέουσιν. ἔνθ' ἂν εὐτυχὲς  
μόλις ἴσθι' ἐξέρπει τις ἀνθρώπων βίη.

Compare with this the words of the recurrent final chorus: πῶδαί καρφαὶ τῶν διαρέουσιν.

v. 689 The Chorus are indignant at what



they think to be the contrast between Ledaia and her husband:

νῦν δ' ἢ μὲν ἔρρει συμφοραῖς, ὃ δ' εὐρυχεῖ.  
 As a matter of fact, the exact opposite is the case.

In v. 923 the chorus employ the highly ironical expression ἄνθρωπος κακῶν.

v. 965 Ledaia abandoned her infant supposing that she would preserve him. This she now supposes not to have been true; that, in so supposing, supposes wrongly, for her original supposition was correct. — The poet (v. 101) the instability of earthly conditions:

τὰ Ἀνθρώπου τριχῶν · οὐδὲν ἐν ταύτῳ μένει.

The chorus, too, have something of the sort in vv. 1006-7. πάθεα πάντα δ' ἐξ ανύτου

εἰς ἄλλας βίους κἄτερος ἀρχαίς.

vv. 1504-06 Ledaia describes her position





ἐλίσσόμεσθ' ἐκείθεν  
ἐνθάδε δυστυχίαισιν  
εὐτυχίας τε πάλιν.

Cyclops.

There is a certain irony, of course, in the exceedingly boastful speech of the Cyclops at v. 316 ff., - in which he expresses his contempt of gods, men, and right customs, - followed by his complete overthrow. — κλέειν σ' ἄνθρωπον, used previously by the Cyclops in regard to Law-shakers (v. 340), is ironically repeated in v. 701. The whole appearance of Polyphemus here bears some resemblance to that of Medea at the end of the play of the same name.

Medea.

vv. 598-602 An ironical snatch from the conversation of Medea and Jason.





14 H. - καὶ μοι γένοιτο δωτὲρ εὐδαίμων βίη,  
καὶ δ' ὄψομαι ὅστις τὴν ἐμὴν κνίσει φρένα.

1 A. - τὰ χρυσὰ μὲν σοι δωτὴρ φαίνεται ποτὶ,  
καὶ δ' εὐτυχόυσα δυστυχὴς εἶναι δόκει.

The tragic irony underlies Casson's speech at v. 759 ff. While he expostulates at some length with Medea for over-extravagance, he little thinks what purpose the gift is to serve.

If the uncertainty of life the messenger says (v. 1229): τὰ θνητῶν δ' οὐ νῦν πρῶτον ἡγοῦμαι τριάν, and also (v. 1228) θνητῶν γὰρ οὐδεὶς ἔστιν εὐδαίμων ἀνὴρ.

Travis looks again in Casson's words at vv. 1270-8. Medea must either tunnel the earth, or fly aloft like a bird, if she would escape retribution. Yet the sound of these impossible alternatives actually has occurred.



Prologue

"The shifting scene" is illustrated in vv. 179-81. One act succeeds another,  $\beta\rho\omega\tau\epsilon\rho\ \delta'\ \epsilon\ \pi\alpha\varsigma\ \alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\theta\eta\alpha\iota\varsigma\ \alpha\iota\omega\upsilon\varsigma$ .

Of rather an ironical nature is the long discourse and carefully laid plan for killing Teuba, which is destined to come to naught.

The surprises in plot are noted by the chorus in v. 1503:

$\text{Καὶ νῦν ἡμεῖς καὶνὸν ἐκ καὶνῶν τόδε.}$

Another feature is found in the speech of Menon (vv. 1504-6), in which he imagines his wife to be slain, whereas she is really safe.

Prologos.

In the mouth of Teuba we find the old proverb again (vv. 509-10):



τῶν δ' ἐσθλαίων

καὶ ἐνταυτοῖς ἐτύχεῖν πρὶν ἐν θάμνῃ.

"Chances and changes" occur once more in vv. 612-13. Things of weight tower on high, things that seem poor from view.

The prosperous, fallen into adversity, misses his former estate (vv. 639-40).

### Phoenissae.

Fortals passes no wealth individually: the gods claim it again when they please (vv. 555-7).

### Fragmenta.

§ 25 (Aedus). There is an ironical difference between the opinion that old men, - τῶν ἑταίρων γενηθέντων, - have of themselves, and their true quality.

οὐδ' οὐκ ἐνδοτὶν, οἰόμεθα δ' εὖ γινώσκοντες.

§ 55 (Alexander). Wealth and luxury.





for all their fine show, do not produce excellence. It takes *πενία*, an unpleasant thing, to do that.

F. 59 (Alexander). *τὸ χρισμὸν ἁπορτί* is usually a blessing, but to this individual it proved destruction.

F. 112 (Hepi). An ironical remark about women. Those well nurtured cause more mischief than the neglected.

F. 176 (Antigone). This shows the futility of trying to dishonor a corpse. As well might one with a spear pierce fully around a wag.

F. 204 (Archelaus). Flux and flow. Material conditions *εἰς ἀνὰ δόξαν*. The wretched rises, the prosperous falls.

F. 328 (Demetrius). The critical situation of rich and poor is set forth. Men give



rather to a rich, scandal than to a virtuous poor man.

F. 332 (Alcaë). The changeful and contradictory conditions of human life are rehearsed in vv. 6-8.

F. 419 (Iro). The ever varying state of man is compared to the cycle of the seasons. Some are growing up, others are being harvested.

F. 452 (Erechontes). The present customs are right wrong. We ought to mourn the newly born and congratulate the dead.

F. 639 (Polydorus). The irony of things goes so far, that life may be death, and death be life.

F. 662 (Pentheus). No one is wholly happy: there are discordant elements in every nature.

F. 813 (Phoenix). In spite of their burden



I was, notwithstanding through experience of death actually long to see another day (cf. Eph. vi. 1252).

F. 830 (Phryxus). Again - is life death, and death life? At least, the living are in pain, and the dead are free from ill.

F. 834 (Eucertum). Even now brings forward some new (καὶνὴν) event, cf. Fr. 102.

#### 6) Tragic of Hope and Expectation

A distinct feature of the irony in Euripides, of which glimpses have been caught in the foregoing, is the disappointment of expectation or frustration of hope. This motif is brought out with some clearness by the following passages:  
colleasias.





v. 1123 Admetus on recognizing his  
resurrected wife:

φάσθ' ἀέδπιον τόνδε.

And Men. (v. 1134) in direct address:

ἔχω δ' ἀέδπιον, οὐτόν ' ὕψισται δοκῶν.

So far does the tendency go that  
ἐδπίς in the majority of instances, where it  
appears to be used seems to have some  
sinister effect, and to signify false or  
mistaken hope.

Andromache.

vv. 27-8 Spoken by

Andromache:-

ἐδπίς μ' αἰ προσέειπε σὺ θένος τέκνον  
ἀδελφὴν τιν' εἶπες καὶ παῖδά σου κακῶν.

v. 444 Menelaus, intending to murder  
the child just referred to:-

οὐκ οὐν ἀποστάξ' αὐτὸν ἐδπίς ἑλπίσιν.





Bacchae.

v. 617 Dionysus says of Pentheus  
whom he had so utterly befuddled:

ἐδπίον ἐβόσκετο.

v. 307 ff. A chorus ode to the mani-  
fest attributes of wine:

μυρία δὲ μυρίοισιν  
ἐτ' εἰσι' ἐδπίδες· αἱ μὲν  
τελευτῶσιν ἐν ὄβω  
βροτῶν, αἱ δ' ἀπέβησαν.

v. 440 Dionysus asks Pentheus if he ranks  
him among his friends only when (ἴστω)

παρὰ λόγον σῶφρονος Βάκχος ἴσῃς;

Teucra.

vv. 351-2. Polyxena, about to be  
sacrificed, tells of her early life:-

ἐπειτ' ἐθρέφθην ἐλπίδων καδῶν ὑπὸ  
βασιλεῦτι νόμφῃ.



v. 650 The servant bids Tecuba observe the  
cups just washed away,

Εἰ σοὶ φανεῖται θαῦμα καὶ παρ' ἑλπίδας.

v. 1032 The chorus, singing of the departed  
Polymester

ψεύσει σ' ὁδῶ τὰς δ' ἐλπίς ἢ σ' ἐπάρσεν.

Telena.

Mendacious reply to Helen's  
account of her eἰς ὄψωρ:

ἄεθλια γὰρ λέγεις.

vv. 656-7 Surprise is again evoked in  
Helen's words to Mendacious: - τίς ἂν τὰς  
ἠδπίσεν; - ἀδύκντον ἔχω σε.

v. 783 To her, she says: ἦ κεῖς ἄεθλιος.

v. 1140ff. τὰ θεῶν are described as

δεῦρο καὶ αὐθις ἐκεῖσε

καὶ πάθιν ἀντιδόχους

πρὸ δῶν τ' ἀνελπίστους τόχους



v. 1523-4 Theoclymenus, demanding a  
 recital from the messenger, says he never  
 expected (οὐ γὰρ ἐδῆμιον εἶναι βέβαια) that  
 one could overcome so many.

Electra.

v. 249 Electra's husband  
 was not one, as she says,

ὦ πατὴρ μ' ἠλπίσεν ἐκδύσειν ποτέ.

v. 570 At the old retainer's announcement  
 of her brother she says:

πῶς εἶπας, ὦ γεραι', ἀνέδμῳ δόρον;

And just below (v. 574-5) to Orestes,  
 Electra declares

ἔχω σ' ἀέδμῳ. .... οὐδέποτε δόξας;  
 to which he responds

οὐδ' ἐγὼ γὰρ ἠδύσα.

v. 718 Electra, reviling the dead body of  
 Aegisthus:





εἰς τοῦτο δ' ἔπειτα ἀναθίς ὅτι ἡδύσας  
ὡς εἰς σ' εὐνὴν τῇ μητέρ' οὐχ ἔσεις κακὴν  
γῆμας.

Thracidae.

v. 150 Expresses to Hecuba,  
regarding the Thracidae:

ὁ γὰρ φρονήσῃ γ' ὄντα σ' ἐπιδύσει παν  
μύρον τοσούτων ἢν ἐπ' ἄλθον Ἑλλάδας  
τὰς τῶνδ' ἀβύδου ἀνατολὰς κατοικεῖν.

Let this unalloyed proposition be made  
good soon afterwards.

vv. 433-4. Iphigeneia, despairing of at-  
taining Hecuba's aid:-

τί δ' ἔτι' ἔσπευας, ὦ τάλαίρα, με  
ἔδοξ' ἰδέσθαι; οὐ μέλλουσα διατελεῖν χάριν.

The irony of the situation is apparent  
from the fact that Iphigeneia regards as a  
false hope one which is destined to prove true.



v. 930 The messenger calls the bound  
Eurytheus ἄεδπτον ὄψιν.

Hercules Furens

vv. 460-1: Megara's experience:

ἢ ποδὺ με δόξας ἐξέπαισαν ἐλπίδες  
ἢν πατρὸς υἱῶν ἐκ λόγων ποτ' ἠλπίσα.

v. 500 Amphitrone agrees:

ὥς ἐλπίδας μὲν ὁ χρόνος οὐκ ἐπίσταται  
σώζειν.

vv. 745-6 The chorus on the fate of Lycus:

πάδιν ἔαυθεν ἢ πάρος οὐπὶτε διὰ φρενὸς  
ἠλπίσεν παθεῖν γὰρ ἄναξ.

v. 771 On the same subject,

δοκμαίων ἐκ τὸς ἠλθεν ἐλπίς. <sup>1</sup>

Suppliants.

vv. 479-80 Spoken by the κῆρυξ:

ἐλπίς βροτῶς κάκιστον, ἢ ποδῶς πόδες  
συνῆψ', ἀγῶνα θυμὸν εἰς ὑπερβολάς.

1. cf. also vv. 803-4.



v. 731 The chorus on the visit of Theseus:  
vñ τὰνδ' ἄεδπῶν ἡμέραν ἰδοῖν' ἐπὶ  
Cf. below, vv. 783-4:

εἴπερ ὄψομαι τὰν ἄεδπῶν ἡμέραν.  
Hippolytus.

vv. 1462-3 Final Chorus:-

κοινὸν τόδ' ἄχος πᾶσι ποδίταις  
ἦδ' ἔν' ἀέδπτω.

Phigeneia Aulidensis.

v. 392 Agamemnon

non on the oath of Helen's suitors:

ἦγε δ' ἐλπίς, οἴμαι μὲν, θεός.

vv. 609-10 Clytemnestra on arriving at Aulis:

ἐλπίδα δ' ἔχω τίς' ὥς ἐπ' ἐσθλῶν γάμων  
πάρεμι.

v. 742 Agamemnon cannot persuade his  
wife to leave all arrangements to him:

ἄποι· μεῖσιν ἦδ', ἐλπίδος δ' ἀποστάδαν.



v. 987 "In expecting you for son-in-law", the Queen tells Achilles, ΚΕΝ' ἢν κατέσχοις ἑδῶς.  
 Agam. (v. 1014), of persuading Agamemnon ψυχρὰ μὲν ἑδῶς.

Cf. also ἑδῶτον φῶς (vv. 1585-6); but the authenticity of this passage is doubtful. In the same category is the pertinent v. 1610:

ἀπροσδόκητα δὲ βροτοῖσι τὰ τῶν θεῶν.

The point which here plays in the plot is likewise worth noticing. Achilles hopes to see Polydamas and Odysseus relies on him, but the hopes of both alike are mistaken. The Chorus render a just verdict thereon (vv. 1403-4).<sup>1</sup>

### Iphigenia Taurica.

Vv. 414-15 Sung by the

Chorus:-

Φίλα γὰρ ἑλπίς ἐρέει' ἐπὶ πᾶσι βροτῶν  
 ἀπλοστός ἀνθρώποις.

1. Cf. p. 218.





vv. 1445-6 From the final chorus:

μάδα γὰρ Τερπνὴν πάνεπιστον  
φάμεν ἀποᾶσι δέδεχμα.

Ion.

vv. 677-8 The chorus, speaking of Creusa as deceived by her husband:-

πόσιν, ἐν ᾧ τὰ πάντ' ἔχουσ' ἐλπίδων  
μέτεχον ἦν τέλειων.

And then mention the intended poisoning of Ion (which fails of success) τόλμας καιρὸς οὐ νυν ἐλπίς ἐφαίνεται (vv. 1063-4).

v. 1345 Creusa, on beholding her child's cradle: τί δὴτα φάσμα τῶν ἀνεπίστων ἱερῶν

Below (v. 1741) she calls Ion ἀεδπτον εὐρημ', and his discovery is ἀδόκητος ἰδυνά (v. 1748). At she is still fearful (v. 1753):

Τὰς γὰρ ἐλπίδας  
ἀπέβαλον πρόσω



Medea.

v. 225 Medea terms Jason's desertion ἄελπτον πρᾶγμα. Cf. v. 788 she says to him: ἔλπίδων δ' ἠμαρτομεν.

v. 1032 In her farewell address to her children:

ἢ μὲν ποθ' ἢ δούταρος εἶχον ἔλπίδας  
Ποδάρας ἐν ὑμῖν.

Crete.

v. 52 Electra, with regard to the fate of the Argives:

ἔλπίδα δὲ δὴ τιν' ἔχουεν ὥστε καὶ θάσσειν.  
The foundation of her hope is Menelaus (v. 53).  
In this hope, however, she is deceived. She survives, but by a different dispensation.

v. 391 Menelaus rebukes Crete:

ὦ παρὰ λόγον αἰ σὴ φανεῖσθ' ἀνορθία.

v. 746 Crete to Menelaus:

εἰς σ' ἔλπις ἡμῶν καταφυγὰς ἔχει κακῶν.



v. 879 The madness of Electra is ἑλπίων  
 γὰρ.

vv. 877-8 Spoken by Electra:

λέσσεθ', ὡς παρ' ἑλπίδας  
μοῖρα βαίνει.

v. 1173 In the proposed murder Electra affirms  
 that they would be fortunate,

εἰ ποθεν ἑλπίτος παραπέσοι σωτηρία.  
There is

v. 345 The burning of Troy is  
 ἔξω μερῶν ἑλπίδων. The two following lines,  
 addressed by Tecuba to Cassandra, contain a  
 similar thought.

ὡς οὐκ ὑπ' αἰχμῆς σ' οὐδ' ὑπ' Ἀργείων δαπὲς  
 γήινος κατέσθαι τίς οὐδ' ἐδόξαδ' ἔστι ποτε.

v. 505 Tecuba refuses to be comforted. How  
 can they restore her? ἑλπίδων ποῖον ὕπν;

v. 652 Cassandra complains that she has





not left remaining even the common property of  
all mortals; ἐδρίς. She cannot deceive herself  
so far as to think that it may yet be well with  
her, although ἰδὺ δ' ἐστὶ καὶ Ἰοκεῖν.

v. 1252 The words of the chorus refer to  
Hecuba: μεδὲν μῆτορ, ἢ τὰς μεγίστας  
ἐδρίδας ἐν σοὶ κατέκαμψε βίου.

Phoenissae.

vv. 310-11 Jocasta to Polynices:

ὦ ἰὼ, πόdis παρὲς  
ἄεττα καδύκντα ματρὸς ὠδένας.

v. 634 Polynices knows not whether he may  
ever again address his native altars, yet

ἐδρίδας δ' οὕτω καθεύδουσ'

on which he depends to become master of the land.  
His hope is, however, disappointed.

Fragmenta.

4. 63 (Alexander): -



Ἐκάβη, τὸ θεῖον ὡς ἀέπτρον ἔρχεται  
ἀναστρεφόμενα.

F. 101 (Alcmena): -

πρόδ' αὖ τοι θεὸς

καὶ τῶν ἀέπτρων εὖ πορ' ἀνθρώποις τέλει.

F. 303 (Bellerophon): -

ὄρῳ δ' ἀέπτρων μυρίων ἀναστροφάς.

F. 395 (Phaethon): -

σπινθάδουσι δὲ πρόδ' ἵπ' ἐπίδων, μάταν  
πόνους ἔχοντες, οὐδὲν εἰδότες σαφές.

F. 652 (Proteus): -

πρόδ' ἐπίδες ψεύδουσι καὶ λόγῳ βροτῶν.

F. 761 (Typhoeus): - Here we have the  
doctrine carried to extremes, bringing its own cure: -

ἀέπτρον οὐδέν, πάντα δ' ἐπίδωκεν ἔργῳ.

c) Irony in Language

Lastly, the sharp verbal contradictions in the



which allusion has already been made (p. 203), may well come under our notice. There are not by any means lacking in the other tragedies, but Euripides has pulled his share, and in conjunction with other points of irony they help to strengthen his portrait of the Paradoxical.

Alcestis.

vv. 242-3 Of Admetus: ἀβίω-  
τον τὸν ἔπειτα χρόνον βιοτεύσει.

v. 339 Of his father and mother: δόξα γὰρ  
ἦσαν οὐκ ἔργῳ φίλοι

v. 352 Spoken by Admetus: δόξω γυναῖκα καί-  
περ οὐκ ἔχων ἔχειν.

v. 521 To Pericles concerning Alcestis: ἔστιν  
τε κούκ' ἐστίν.

v. 735 Alcestis will render father and  
mother ἀταῖς παῖδας ὄντας

Cybele and Apollo.



v. 739 Pentheus is asked if he thinks τὰ τέρα  
δ' οὐ θεῶν? And Teiresias charges him (v. 613) with  
having made matters παῖδων ἄπαιδας.

v. 1084 Of unwelcome news: ἀκούσαι δ' οὐκ ἀ-  
κούσθ' ὅμως θέλω.

v. 1144 In the struggle at Delphi:

Κραυγὴν δ' ἐν εὐφάμοισι σύσφαιμος δόμοις.

Basileus.

v. 815 Addressing to Pentheus:

ὅμως δ' ἴδεις ἂν ἠδέως ἅ σοι πικρά;

v. 913 Of Pentheus: σπεύδοντα ἀσπώδαστα.

v. 1001 The force of the Basileus is expressed as  
τὰν ἀνίκητον ὡς κρατήσων βίᾳ.

Hebeus.

v. 194 Of King Kena's sentence: συ-  
σφαιμος φάμας.

v. 566 The executioner described as οὐ θέλων  
τε καὶ θέλων.





v. 612 Cf Polixena:

νύμφην τ' ἀνύμφον παρθέον τ' ἀπάρθεον.

v. 948 γάμος οὐ γάμος.

v. 1121 Polixenē f. Helenē:

ἀπώδεσ' οὐκ ἀπώδεσ' ἀλλὰ μειδόνως.

Helenē.

v. 362 ἔρχ' ἀνέρχ' - v. 1134 γέρας οὐ γέρας.

Hippolytus.

v. 808: ἀβίωτος βίον τύχα.

v. 1144: πτόμῳ ἀπτόμῳ.

Iphigenia Aulidensis.

v. 1043 Agamemnon

to his daughter:

οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως φῶ τοῦτο καὶ μὴ φῶ, τέκνον.

v. 1139 Telytaemnestia to Agamemnon:

ὁ νοῦς ὅδ' ἀντὶς νοῦν ἔχων οὐ τυγχάνει.

v. 1370 Spoken by Iphigenia:-

τὰ δ' ἀδύναθ' ἡμῶν καρτερεῖν οὐ ράδιον



Iphigenia Taurica.

iv. 201-2 σπείδει δ' ἀσπού-

δαστ' ἐπὶ σοὶ δαΐμων.

v. 566 χάριν ἄχαριν.

v. 568 *Quester, of himself:*

ἔστ', ἄθλιός γε, κούδαμῶ καὶ πανταχοῦ.

vv. 770-1 *Iphigenia describes herself as*

ἢ ν' Αἰδίδι βῶσ', τοῖς ἐκεῖ δ' οὐ βῶσ' ἔτι.

v. 888 δι' ὁδοὺς ἀνάδους.

Ion.

v. 286 τιμᾷ γ' ἄτιμ'.

v. 307 *Ly Creusa:* τᾶλλ' εὐτοχοῦσ' οὐκ εὐτοχεῖς.

vv. 783-4 ἄφατον ἄφατον ἀναύδατον

λόγον ἐμὸν θρεῖν

v. 1444 *Ion calls himself* ὁ κατθανών τε  
κού θανάων.

Quester.

v. 819: τὸ καλὸν οὐ καλόν.



v. 904 Ἀργεῖος οὐκ Ἀργεῖος.

Troades.

vv. 1291-2 ἂ δὲ μεγαλόποδὶς ἄποδὶς  
ᾧδωκεν.

Phoenissae.

v. 1495 οὐδ' ἐπὶς οὐκ ἐπὶς.

v. 1757 χάριν ἀχάριτον.

(Also v. 1306 - πτότος ἀπτότος).

Sophocles.

It is interesting to see how Sophocles stands related to Euripides in the matter of Fate & the Tragic Existence, of Expectation, and of verbal contrasts. Aeschylus, because considerably removed in time, has a less direct bearing on the subject; but Sophocles is almost of our poet's generation. A very full study of Sophocles would, however, be out of place in the





present paper: therefore, I have aimed, not to arrive at and state certain general results, which, properly substantiated to the Euripidean material, will have a kind of perspective to the conclusions reached.<sup>1</sup>

Hippocrates' belief in the gods and adherence to the old religion is, of course, assumed at the start. He takes care to leave us in no doubt on that point.

His employment of the different conceptions of Fate seems, as a rule, to be weaker and more colorless than in Euripides, and to have less of personification about it. By way of illustration, I have divided the references under each head into weaker and stronger, with an asterisk (\*) to denote extremes in either class.

Μοῖρα. Μένειν — O. T. 376, 713, 804, 1302, 1458, J. C. 174, 275, 1221. Cat. 170. C. H. 516, 927.

1. Only the extant dramas are used.



Ἐλ. 1074. *Trach.* 103, 551, 1239. *Phil.* 331, 681.

*Stinger* — *S. T.* 887. *D. C.* 1450, 1546. *Ant.* x187.

Ἐλ. 1714. *Phil.* 1460.

Μόρος. *Weak* — *Ant.* 848, 997, 1039. *El.* 859

μόριμον (τό). *Weak* — *Ant.* 236

Μοιριδία. *Strong* — *Ant.* 951

Τύχη. *Weak* — *S. T.* 263, \*680, 776. *Ant.*

980. *El.* 48. *Phil.* 1326. *Stinger* — *S. T.*

472, 479 and 477 by the epithet *beasts*, \*1050.

*D. C.* 1020. *Ant.* 328, 1158. *El.* 327.

Δαίμων. *Weak* — *D. C.* 76, 1337, 1370, 1443.

*Ant.* 1215. *El.* 1157, 1306. *Trach.* 910. *Stinger* —

*S. T.* 1311, 1479. *D. C.* 1567, 1750. *Ant.* 832. *Ant.*

243, 504. *El.* 499. *Trach.* 1025. *Phil.* 1105, 1180.

Πότος. *Weak* — *Ant.* 83, 861, 881, 1296.

*Trach.* 88. *Stinger* — *D. C.* 1324. *Ant.* 1346. *Phil.*

1186.

Ἀνάγκη, always strong when personified, occurs



in Ant. 1100, and περὶ πλούτου in I.C. 721, Ant.  
1337-8.

tragic irony is fairly abundant in  
Sophocles, but the sharp surprises and changes of  
daily life are not so strongly marked as in the  
real poet. A few good instances may be  
cited:

Oedipus Tyrannus. Final Chorus based  
on Solon's proverb of σκότης τὴν τελευτήν.

Oedipus Colonus. The genuine pessimism  
of the Anthology looks out from v. 1225.

Oiac. The uncertainty of human life is  
expressed in vv. 125-6 (Odysseus) and 131-2  
(Athena). A proper ethical moral is drawn.

Trachiniae. vv. 1-3 repeat the proverb of  
Solon. The ceaseless evolution of mortal  
conditions is enlarged upon at v. 129 ff., but  
is ascribed to the gods. It is vain to protest





The mouse (vv. 9 + 3 + 4). The future is insatiable (v. 1270).

Philocetes. Sanger attends to this in both pleasure and pain (vv. 502-3).

Instances of the ironical *chôris* are decidedly numerous. The important ones are O. T. 1432; O. C. 1105, 1120; Ant. 330, 365; Chi. 778, 678 (compare the final chorus), 715, 1352; El. 180, 1127, 1203, 1281; Trach. 203, 667, 673; Phil. 567-8, 852. The lines in type (Ant. vv. 615-17) furnish a valuable commentary on the entire conception in both tragedies.

Verbal contradictions are as follows: O. T. 1214 (*ἀγαθὸν γάρον*); O. C. 1014 (*ὄντιν ἄρρατὸν τ' ἔσται*), 1010 (*βίος οὐ βίωτος*); Ai. 218 (*δοῖον ἄρρατὸν*); 665 (*ἄδωρα δῶρα*); El. 1154 (*καὶ τὰρ ἀναιδέταρ*); Phil. 848 (*ὑπὸν ἄνθρωπος*).

And finally, we may pause to remark





several elements that often go to make up an Euripidean deus ex machina with about the same value in Sophocles, but ranged under some other name.

For example, there are external divine signs in the atmosphere when Odysseus ventures to give Polyneices his last rites (cont. 417 ff.). — Thunder and lightning summon Odysseus away (S.C. 1461 (with the chorus ode), 1478), and at the last escort him from life (S.C. 1606, 1626, 1661). Compare also the whole passage beginning at S.C. 1518, which contains prophecy, obtained directions for a burial that shall protect the land (cf. ekklēsia in Eur. Supp.), and references to the call of Telemon. — For effective action by a deus ex machina see esp. 51, corroborated in 850 ff. Odysseus has the precipitating functions of a deus at the close of the Naxos (v. 1118 ff.), but he is



-27-

Charged to argue long and steadily, unless the gods in person allow no dispute.

The single and case of a deus ex machina in Sophocles is reserved for the final section!

We have come far enough to survey the road over which we have travelled. Fate and irony are two of the uppermost ideas in Euripides as a whole: fate and irony are pre-eminently uppermost in the theophrastics of Euripides. They are so fused, in fact, that we may justly assign the Irony of Fate as a sufficient artistic motive for their existence.

We may easily apprehend how attractive the idea would have been to a man of the poet's characteristics. Three<sup>2</sup> accounts of him practically agree: 1) σπουδὴν δὲν προεἰπεῖν καὶ ἀποφύγεω καὶ τωθάσει οὐδὲ τῶν ἄλλων

1. P. 333-

2. Gellius N. A. 15, 20, 8: Vita Eur.: Suidas.



μεταθνήσκω; 2) σκυθρωπὸς δὲ καὶ σύννοος καὶ  
αὐστηρὸς ἐφαίνετο καὶ μισογέλως; 3) σκυθρωπὸς  
δὲ ἦν τὸ ἦθος καὶ ἀπειδὴς καὶ φεύγων τὰς  
συνουσίας. He harbored no illusions about  
life.

At every interposition of some god, - Fate's  
messenger, - you note the irony of the situa-  
tion; the human characters become the  
veriest puppets; their carefully laid plans  
are no better than those of mice. Or perchance,  
on the contrary, what seemed irremediable  
sorrow is turned into joy, or the bond of  
friendship is shown to require an oath. Every-  
where there is the same violent contrast. It  
is the anagnorisis of the chorus all over again:-

καὶ τὰ δοκούντ' οὐκ ἐτελέσθην,  
τῶν δ' ἀδοκίμων πόρον εὗρε θεός.

There is a lurking bitterness in their joy.

1. Cf. Wilamowitz - *Antiquities of the Hellenic World*, p. 53 (top), -  
"nicht als Körperlose abstraktionen."





happiness, after all. Some few more geniuses have delighted in thus leaving a sting at the end of their work. So Keine, in the lyric to his lady's eyes, each stanza of which ends with "Mein Liebchen, was willst du mehr?" concludes in the following fashion:-

"Mit deinen schönen Augen  
du hast mich gequält so sehr,  
Und hast mich zu Grunde gerichtet;  
Mein Liebchen, was willst du mehr?"

Euripides intends something more than such a saucy flirt and flutter. He knows the unvanquished cruelty of existence, - its surprises, disappointments, defeats, failures, wrecks, - and the blind (sure when malicious) powers that govern all things, - a grotesque *Tyxn*, or worse, an inexorable *Moipa*. By the deus ex machina he sets them before us in their most



dramatic and concrete form, and shows and  
pings but keeps them like in a living  
extension of the fifth century. There must  
have been in this, too, a certain pleasure  
for the tragic iconoclast.



Irregular Cases

7

News by Machine



Before proceeding to apply the theory of the Paradoxical to each single occurrence of the deus ex machina (the presence of the Fate-motif has been already demonstrated, p. 184), it is necessary to stop a moment in order to define our terms. There are three plays, namely, in which the deus varies from the standard type. They are the Trochilus Furens, the Trippolytus and the Bacchae. In all the rest the god appears at the end and, for the first time, and adopts a more or less set form of speech.

The first case is perhaps the simplest. The trouble is very largely one of position. For, in the Trochilus Furens, Lyssa and Iris descend in the middle of the piece, forming a sort of intermedio. Furthermore, they come not to prohibit nor to enjoin, but to perform





Their characteristics at first sight, then, look to be something out of the common, but with more minute attention (as will presently be developed), any discrepancies of detail vanish in the coincidence of ruling ideas. We may therefore admit the drama, for the present, to the general category.

In the Trojan some difficulty arises from the fact that Artemis, - the Goddess of the epilogue, - is directly interested in the plot, and the necessity of her interference has likewise been questioned. Yet on closer examination the connection of the Goddess with the passing incidents of the story is even to be comparatively slight. She first appears on the scene at v. 1253, and continues in conversation with Theseus & Hippolytus until near the close, when, con-



than to the usual custom, she departs. The  
 opening words to *Thelma* are given in the same  
 unpoetical style. Inasmuch as her earlier re-  
 marks are directed to clear the father's mind  
 of error, it is commonly assumed (as by Thra-  
 der) that she deserves much to reveal the truth,  
 though this content (cf. *Carthage*, *Introd.*  
 to *Edit. of Tuppington*, p. XXXVII and *Williamson*,  
 (*Conclusions*) *The Sage on Tuppington*, p. 52 of  
 this edit.) that the real state of affairs might  
 have been exposed by other means. Still, *Stel-  
 mis* has ample excuse for coming forward  
 on the ground of self-vindication. *Cyprio-  
 dote's* triumph has up to that point been  
 complete: it remains to be shown that  
 loyal duty shall not lack appreciation.  
 In other respects the phenomenon *Thelma's*  
 nearly enough with other cases to deserve



a place in our treatment.

The Thucchaë presents a rather different aspect. It is a kind of Greek Passion Play. Dionysus is a genuine dramatic character, as much so as any God in Eschylus. The end of the action shows him at the height of his success, pronouncing judgment upon his prostrate foes. The matter of his entrance there is involved in difficulties: it is usually supposed that though a lacuna in the text his first sentences have been lost. He indulges in a short prophecy, such as are common to dei ex machina, but this alone does not seem sufficient to allow him to rank with the rest. His function is less to reveal than to continue the progress of events. There is no





suggestion of fact - all is speculation for per-  
sonal insight - no any marked view of  
circumstance,



Exposition  
of the  
Ironical Element  
as found in  
the Empiricon  
Deus ex Machina.

Discussion  
of  
Peculiarities of Detail  
in the  
Fable.



It is now, in order to explain the several  
tragedies from the point of view of the inex-  
plicable and the Terrible Suprising. As a first  
step thereto we may observe the frequent sudden-  
ness of the apparition. In only three plays is  
the god ever beforehand by any of the characters  
(Cratomacha, Electra, Ion): in six (Telamon, Pe-  
culus, Thyestes, Supplices, Hippolytus, Sphigmina, Thyestis,  
Electra) the deity stands before them without  
warning. There is similar lack of announcement  
in the unhappy Medea, and in the Philoctetes  
of Ephorus. This of itself is bound to produce  
a shock of surprise. I continue with the sig-  
nate plays:—

Cratomacha

Thetis arrives at the  
most unexpected moment, just after Pelias  
has called upon her in dream to hold her



be accomplished. The tears overblowing sorrow into  
joy. Helen and Orestes, so far successful, are  
to be disappointed by the unexpected turn of the  
dice. The friendless Andromache is to become  
Queen of the Hecyones.

Telemachus.

Theoclymenus is brought to a  
halt at the very moment when he feels his  
superiority and proposes to sweep all before  
him (cf. his words in vv. 1630, 1635 and 1637). He  
has to see two great convictions wotted up, -  
first, that he had a right to marry Helen,  
and second, that he had been unjustly cheated  
by his sister. Menelaus and Helen, after all  
their wanderings and hardships, are promised  
immortal felicity.

Electra.

The chorus in v. 1232 have just





made known their solemn verdict on the tragedy of the Atridae: -

τέρμα κακῶν, μεγάλας δόλους οὖν.

The sentence is no more uttered than, as if straightway to contradict it, to demonstrate that there is no termination to ill while life lasts, the miscreants come gliding down. τὸ δ' Ἄγος ἐκδιδῶν (v. 1250) is their sharp and sudden command to Orestes, who has been investigating his mother's remains in a kind of mad-doggy dog (v. 1221). Long is the wandering course of madness he must run, and fearful the trial that sets him free - for what? To found a new city in Arcadia. No hope is held out of a return to beloved Argos. At the same time he is saved from the utter despair of vv. 1184-5.

Electra, likewise, contrary to her expectations (v. 1189), - is provided with a husband.



Peuceles, the close friend of Arctus, let me too  
must endure the loss of her native land, - a  
dead punishment (v. 1312).

Peuceles Furus.

This drama presents  
extremely plain conditions. The scene descends  
upon Peuceles at the very height of his tri-  
umph, when he has but just accomplished his  
vengeance, and at the moment that the chorus  
is celebrating his exploits (v. 805 ff.). All his  
happiness, all his success is made a demonstra-  
tion and boasting.

Supplies.

Arctus who suddenly ap-  
pears at the end seems to emphasize the un-  
certainty of friendship. Arctus has voiced  
his thanks in the proper form, - "emphatic  
gratitude";  $\gamma\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota\tau\alpha\ \gamma\alpha\rho\ |\ \pi\alpha\lambda\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\tau\alpha\ \epsilon\upsilon\chi\alpha\iota\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\iota$



ἀπὸν ὀφείδουσιν (vv. 1178-1). So, the ~~life~~ <sup>life</sup> gives one something to Athens, but do men always pay their debts? Themas may think so, the Athenians, considering the greatness of the service, might think so, but the wise immortal Passes better. The note of business counsel rules her first words: *ὦ τῶν ἀέθελ' ὅτ' ἄν' ἔσται xxx πασίως ὅτ' ἂν ἀέθελ' ὅτ' ἄν' ἔσται* (vv. 1185-6), "Let some 'tangible' return for your labor (*ἀπὸν σὺν ἀχθ' ἡμῶν*), — *ἀέθελ' ὅτ' ἄν' ἔσται*. It is the spirit of Greek cunning and shrewdness, as opposed (for instance) to the attitude of Hercules in *Thucyd. Hist. Græc. Lib. II, 1*.

Supplies.

As already stated (p. 284), Artemis comes forward just when Aphrodite seems to have won the day. But not only that, she steps in at the moment that Themas assumes the air of a righteous judge, proposing

1. And compare even the simple nobility of the *Homeric* *Odyssey*, who is a figure of far more heroic mould than that in the *Supplies* (C. C. 65).





to enjoy his son's damned catastrophe, and she changes him to the pleading criminal. Once she comes to a pause in her story, but it is only to add a sting (v. 1314): Theaetetus has not yet comprehended the measure of his own unworthiness.

Phrygia Taurica.

Athena brings help to the fugitive, just when all help, by the contrary action of the sea, seems cut off. She puts Theaetetus in the wrong at every point (cf. his speech vv. 17-22-34). There is a taunting assurance in her initial interrogation; no answer is possible for Theaetetus now; he is in the grasp of a higher power. The pursuit, then, is not to be made; the quarrel is not to be impeded; the Euboean women (v. 1467) are not to be punished. Even Pericles is brought



favors the King.

Ion.

Athena brings order for Ion out of confusion and shows him destined to enjoy unexampled fame and prosperity in place of a dubious existence. Her entire proclamation produces a burst of joy, too, from Creusa, who had hitherto regarded even the most favorable developments with a semi-distrust. Xuthus is to be placed in the humorously critical position of hiding a supposed trespass from the real trespasser.

Creusa.

The Creusa affords me of the very best instance of the ironical principle, which is pushed to its limits. Fate looks out upon the angry and desperate combatants *καὶ δα τῶνδ' ὁρῶν καὶ πόδας*. Everything turns out



in a way, precisely opposite to what would have been expected. Helen, whose death was plotted, is secure. Menelaus after unnumbered trials on her account is to take up life with a new consort. Orestes, expecting either death or exile at home, is sent to foreign parts. The hostage whom he is on the point of receiving is to become his wife; to Chrysothemis she may never belong. He is anticipating marriage, but death shall be his lot. Electra, awaiting execution, shall lead a happier life as spouse of Pyrrades. Menelaus, instead of killing Orestes, must establish him in command of Argos. The hostile populace is to be reconciled.

In spite of the uncertain chronology of Euripides's plays, one may fancy a gradual increase of violence in the irony of the deus ex machina from the Suppliants to the Orestes.





corresponding to a gradual increase of bitterness in the poet's life, and then make due allowance for the views of T. V. Müller (p. 11) and of Wilamowitz (p. 2-3)

Schrader's theory that the deus ex machina was a substitute for tragic development seems to me untenable. Otherwise, the phenomenon would almost inevitably occur at the end of every drama, instead of in a certain number only. In spite of this there is something striking in the prevalence of the prophetic element in speeches of the dei. The revelation of the future which they grant is usually, as has been shown above (p. 114), termed by them "the will of Fate". Their initial action, positive or negative, is in fulfilment of that Fate as it applies to the present; their subsequent proclama-





ation is a record of its demands for the future. But they are seldom content with a brief exposition. The moment is, from a dramatic and literary standpoint, too valuable to be so lightly passed by. Aside from the fact that the absolute authority of the deity, his wide vision and larger range of years tended to produce that calm which the Greeks deemed so desirable at the conclusion of a drama, it was advantageous as a mere device to assign him a speaking part of some length. In this way is introduced the rather effective trick, by which in a narrative set back to a remote past a prophecy is made of events which the heroes know have come to pass: it was still nearly new in the age of Euripides. Homer lacks examples, although he has, in both *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, inspired declaration, followed later by a description of



their accomplishment. Aeschylus has something similar in his Prometheus (v. 700 ff.), where Prometheus tells Io what the future holds in store for her, as well as in Eumenides, vv. 683-4, 690-93 (sanctity of the Areopagus) and v. 990 ff. (future glory of Athens). After Euripides, Virgil adopted the same method in Book VI of his Aeneid (v. 756 ff.) for depicting the mighty destiny of Rome. And it has survived to modern times, as may be seen (for one example of many) in the twenty-first section of Longfellow's Hiawatha.

From some such source, in all probability, arises the mass of details and local allusions with which the denizens of heaven lend their predictions. We can understand the appeal which the experiences and prophecies of Oedipus in the scene of Colonus (cf. p. 256) would make to the people of the neighboring city, and



the interest attaching to an utterance like Cassandra's in *Iliad*. vi. 433-43 is plain even to a modern scholar: in like manner, doubtless, the mention of names and tradition will prove to the audience created a kind of link between them and the heroic story. It is not a long task to separate the divine pronouncements which are directly germane to the plot or situation from the less important.

Cytherea.

The principal point is that Pelus shall be united with Thetis and with Achilles for ever; of slightly subordinate interest is the proper burial of Hector, - a graver matter from an ancient than from a modern standpoint. In making good disposal of Cytherea the dynasty of the Peloponnesians (cf. *Thuc.* II, 80; *Id.* I, 176) is incidentally







accounted for. To the main injunction, again, is appended a commemoration of Luce (near to Corbilles), and Lepine island (where Boers damaged the fleet of Xerxes).

Helena.

The address of the *theodiscus* has a double purpose, first, to secure the reconciliation of Theodiscus with Helene, - not a factory reasons therefor being afforded, - and second, to give Helene and Helen assurances of prosperity temporal and eternal. The first motive is kept tolerably pure. The second brings in an etymology for the desert isle of Helene (near by and well known).

Electra.

The primary spirit of the *theodiscus* is to outline the wanderings of Electra, the next to describe of Electra's band, and the



last to secure the proper burial of Cleopatra and  
Clytemnestra. When the progress of the hero's  
travels takes him to Athens, the opportunity is  
at once seized to magnify Cleopatra by the story  
of Teleresthus and others. Soon after an appro-  
priate origin is assigned for a city of Macedonia  
(cf. Hist. I, 68) near the shrine of Zeus Lycaeus.

The burial of the queen necessitates the  
narrative of Menelaus and Helen, with an  
account of the Eidoion.

### Hercules Furens.

No prophecy occurs in  
this piece. (Immediate future only treated.)

### Supplices.

The chief address of Athena  
is to Theseus, instructing him to require an  
oath; the subordinate one to the Argive youth.  
In detailing the manner of the oath the goddess



arranges for the presentation of a commemorative tripod (at Delphi? still extant when the play was produced?), and for the burial of the knife as a expensive charm. A precinct is also set apart.

In the second portion of the speech, the name of Ceryneia (probably familiar to the Athenians from Theban history) is foretold.

Hippolytus.

Ceryneia devotes herself 1) to implicating Theseus in the death of Hippolytus, 2) to shifting her responsibility to stronger shoulders, 3) to comforting Hippolytus. This comfort consists chiefly of revenge on foes and reconciliation with Theseus; but further a custom, which possibly survived, of 'begging' is introduced by the goddess. (And as Wilamowitz, die Igeu von Troja, pp. 20-31 on his sketch of the play)





Iphigenia Taurica.

Athena's remarks are directed in nearly equal proportions to Thoas, Cretes, and Iphigenia. The first named receives a straight enough out and out injunction. When she comes to Cretes, in sketching his future course Athena makes sacred the village of Talaë (mentioning also the name of Brauron), institutes a new festival custom, besides the ruling that hereafter a tie vote acquits, — and all of this in Attica, with a vision of Mt. Caperia towering up, across an Eubœa.

Ion.

The principal theme of Athena's discourse is the proving of Ion's identity, together with an outline of his future and posterity (this gives a historical origin to the Libanotes,





*Hoplotes*, *Agades* and *Agiores*, at the same time completely vanquishing *Cypello*. Incidentally the founding of *Leoris* and settlement of *Cephala* (probable reference to *Cheremis*'s victory at *Rhuim*) are foretold.

*Crestes*.

The first utterance of *Cypello* settles the future of *Crestes*, *Pyraides*, *Mendians* and *Electra*. The places celebrated are the *Parrhasian* plain and its duration (cf. the *Electra*). Considerable attention seems devoted, in the second place, to establishing a cult of *Zeus* as patron goddess, - "Queen of the Sea": and this, of course, gains in emphasis by being allowed to close the play.



Structure  
of the  
Speeches  
of  
Lee ex Machina

Analysis.



The speech allotted to a day or evening seldom possesses more unity, except the general unity of purpose, - to fulfill the mandate of Fate. The common type has practically four main elements (one is often lacking), - Command, Simple Narrative (or Statement), Exposition of Reasons, and Prophecy. Of these, the Statement of Reasons is usually closely bound up with the Command: the other divisions are kept appreciably distinct. For the sake of completeness and clearness, a set of analyses of the several discourses are here presented.<sup>1</sup>

It is worth noting that almost every day opens by calling one of the characters by name, and immediately introducing himself in the same fashion. Athena in the Iliad, who begins with 'and Iphigeneia', does just the same up to the last of address by name, and then

1. Only the principle declaration is taken into account in each case.





case differs from the rest in that she is compelled first to encourage the character (Ion) not to retreat, whereas the other Alci are concerned to prevent an advance.

Characters.

Andromacha.

Thetis speaks:

A. Address. Introduction.

Command. — B. καὶ τῶρα, — encouragement,

Reason. — 1) by her example

Command. — C. Now to the matter in hand; you must

1) Buy Neoptolemus in order that

Reason. — a) Reproach may rest on

I) Delphi,

II) Orestes.

2) Little Andromache — & her



son among the Molossians,  
that

Reason. —

a) A synastri may be founded,  
because

I) Our race is not destined  
to be extinguished.

Prophecy. —

D. You shall yourself become a  
god, in order that you may

Reason. —

1) I will with me and  
2) Behold Achilles.

Repetition.

Command. —

E. Proceed to action, i.e.

1) Bury the corpse,

2) Await me at the tomb, for

Reason. —

a) This pleases Zeus. You must  
perform the will of Fate.

Command. —

3) παύου — Cease tears, for

Reason. —

a) All must die.



A slight symmetry is observable: Thrown  
not; Thrown forward; Ethe. Thrown back; Thrown  
with me; Thrown forward; Thrown with me; Thrown  
not. (a, b, c, d, b, d, a.)

## Helena.

The Discursi speak: I) to the Discursi

A. Address, Introduction.

Command. —

B. Hold, for

1) Your proposed marriage was  
contrary to Fate and

2) Your sister harms you not, for

a) The honors

I) The gods, and

II) Her father.

3) Also Helen had to remain  
only till now, when

a) She returns to her own house.

Reason. —



### Repetition.

Command. — C. Therefore hold your sword, for

Reason. — 1) We should have come earlier, but for Fate.

### — (II) To Helen. —

Command. — A) Sail for you early, for

Reason. — 1) We will escort you.

Prophecy. — B) At death you shall be a  
god with us, for

Reason. — 1) Zeus wishes it.

Prophecy. — C) An island shall be called after  
you.

### — (III) To Menelaus —

Prophecy. — A) Fate decrees you the right to  
inhabit the Island of the Blest, for

Reason. — 1) Divinities hate not the noble.

The first command to Theodorus is also the last





Electra.

The women speak:

A. Address. Introduction.

B. Your deed brought us.

C. The queen is rightly punished, but

D. You do not rightly, and

E. That is - but we must be silent.

F. Your future is settled by your  
and fate

Command. — { G. Marry Electra to Polydorus, and  
H. Leave charges yourself, for

Reason. — { 1) The matricide may not enter  
the city, and

2) The Furies are upon your track.

Command. — I. Requiring others, you homage at  
the temple of Pallas, for

Reason. — 1) The shall shield you.

Command. — J. Then on Messengers (with —



description of the place) you  
must depend your life.

Prophecy. — K. Equal votes will be your safety,  
since

Reason. — 1) Loxias will assume responsibility.

Prophecy. — { L. (Hence arises the custom of  
the = acquitted.)

M. The Furies thereupon shall  
go underground.

Command. — { N. You must dwell in Cerealia.  
O. Good citizens shall bury Hegesias.

Command. — P. Your mother Menelaus and Helen  
will bury, for

Reason. — 1) They have just arrived.

Narrative. — Q. (Helen has just come from  
Egypt, for

1) only her image went to Troy)

Command. — R. Let Pyraides with your sister



set out.

Command. —

S. And do you hasten, for

1) Fate decrees you comfort  
after trouble.

G and H are repeated by R and S

Parables of Jesus.

A dispute between two Jews.

(I) This speaks:

A. Address (ὑποτίθεται). Introduction.

B. We come not to harm the city, but

C. The house of one man only.

D. Formerly τὸ πρῶτον said him but

E. Now both Tera and Tera to  
take vengeance on him

Command. —

F. So you therefore, Tera, madden  
him, that

Reason. —

1) He may learn our double wrath, for





1) Athena, if she gets it  
scot free, the Gods are made  
of none account.

(II) Lyssa speaks:

A. Self-introduction.

Statement. — B. I advise you both not to  
make me harm this man, for

Reason. — 1) He is his worthy of his honors.

[dispute of three lines.]

Finally, Lyssa:

Statement. — { C. I act unwillingly.

D. But if I must see, I must.

[description of the deed: a substitute for prophecy]

Supplies.

Athena speaks: (I) to Theseus

A. Address. Introduction

Command. — B. Surrender not these bones



till you receive an oath,  
to wit:

- 1) No future expedition of  
Lepidus against Athens.
- 2) A prevention of others from  
any such attempt.
- 3) Infractin of this oath  
shall cause utter ruin.

Comment. —

C. The vessel for sacrifice must  
be a tripod, to be used as follows:

- 1) Let blood within it,
- 2) Engrave the oath on the  
outside.
- 3) Offer it to the god of Delphi  
as
  - a) a memorial and
  - b) a witness.

Comment. —

D. Buy the dagger used beside



Reason. — the corpse-heaps, that  
1) It might cause them terror,  
if they came as enemies.

Command. — E. This done, release the bodies,

Command. — F. Deliver to Apollo the site of  
the funeral pyres.

(II) to the Argives.

Prophet — { A. You shall, when grown, take  
vengeance on thebes.  
B. You, cregeiaeus, shall be commander.  
C. Called Epigoni, you shall de-  
spoil the enemy

Hippolytus.

[Note. — The speech corresponding  
most nearly to that of the regular chorus begins at  
v. 1416.]

A. Address. Introduction (v. 1283  
to 1285)



B. Gaius's rhetorical questions.

C. Phaedra, smitten with love for Hippolytus, unable to master her passion and fearing detection, slew herself. Your son yielded not, nor betrayed her secret. Her testimony is false.

Narrative. —

D. It is not your fault so much as that of Cypris. He succeeded because gods are mutually non-interfering. The gods love not the death of the righteous, but destroy the impious.

[The chorus with Hippolytus]

Command. —

E. Cease grief (v. 14 & 16), for

Reason. —

1) It will be fittingly avenged.

Prophecy. —

F. To you, Hippolytus, shall great honors be paid.





Command. — G. Thereus, be pardoned; embrace your son, and

Command. — H. Son, hate not your father, for  
Reason. — 1) Fate slew you.

Statement. — 1. I must hence ere the death of my

Ephigania Laurica.

Athena speaks: (I) to Theseus.

A. Address. Introduction.

Command — B. Cease pursuit, for  
Reason. — 1) Theseus was fated to come here,  
that he

a) might bring his sister home,  
and

b) convey the sacred image to  
my land.

2) Also you cannot reach him, for  
a) Poseidon has already calmed the sea.



(I) to Cretes.

Command. — { A. Cretes, go your way, and  
B. In certain sanctuaries (designated)  
Temple, and  
C. Establish a festival custom

(II) to Iphigenia.

Command. — A. You, Iphigenia, must be  
mistress of ceremonies at Brauron.

Prophecy. — B. To you shall rites be dedicated.

Paraphrase: And as for these Greek  
women I desire them sent back. [Eschylus?]

(III) to Cretes.

Prophecy. — A. There shall be a precedent  
established, Cretes, from your  
sequit in a *choregus*.

Command. — B. Depart, then.

(IV) to Thous.

Command. — A. Be not angry, Thous



The repetition of II, A by IV, B is a familiar  
feature; and the symmetry of address, - a, b, c,  
b, a, - seems interesting.

Ion.

Criton speaks: (I) to Ion.

A. Criton (ὡς δ' ἔπειτα). Introduction.

B. Apollo sends me as a sub-  
stitute, that

1) He may avoid reproach.

C. Creusa is your mother: Apollo  
your father. Your home has  
been not a true one, but the  
most fitting.

D. This father rescued you by  
craft, fearing the mutual  
murder of yourself and mother.

E. He proposed to reveal all

Κριτωνος. -





in Athens, but now  
Command. — F. Listen to my story. (To both.)  
(II) to Creusa.

Command. — G. Take your child and place  
him on the royal throne, for

Reason. — 1) He is sprung from Erechtheus.

Prophecy. — H. Then shall he be famous, for

Reason. — 1) His children shall form  
leading tribes, and

2) Their children shall colonize  
the Cyclades and Asia, whence  
a) Shall come the name Ionians.

Prophecy. — I. So Erechtheus and you shall be  
born two sons, viz.,

1) Demos, who shall found Athens, and

2) Acheus, tyrant near Rhium.

Narrative. — J. Apollo is wholly in the right, for  
1) He shielded you from friends,



2) He built, for me, carrying the  
child hither, and

3) He brought him up.

Command — K. Keep the truth concealed, in  
order that

Reason. —

- { 1) Luther may feel contented, and  
2) You may fare prosperously.

Prophecy. — L. Farewell. For the future, fate  
is propitious.

At this point the practical repetition, or en-  
forcement of C and D by J.

### Crestos.

(Apollo speaks.)

Command. —

Command. —

Reason. —

A. C + D. Introductory.

B. Bless your wife, Mendacus,

C. And you, too, Crestos, that

1) you may both listen to my  
words.



(I) to Menelaus.

Narrative. -

A. Helen is saved, for

1) Prescued her at Zeus's bidding, since

a) Being immortal, she must reign with Eos and Helios, and

b) The gods merely made use of her here as the means of expiating a fault.

(II) to Ixestes.

Comment. -

A. You must live for a year in the Parrhasian plain.

B. then proceed to Athens, and

C. There submit to judgment.

Prophecy -

D. In the 400 pages, by a vote of the gods you shall be acquitted.



Command. —

F. Fate leaves your marriage  
with her whom you would  
slay, for

Reason. —

1) Neoptolemus shall be  
disappointed, for

a) This fate is to die a happy

Command. —

G. Marry your sister to Pyrrhus.

Prophecy. —

H. A happy future awaits you

(III) to Menelaus.

Command. —

A. Leave Argos to Creon

B. Manage Sparta yourself.

Prophecy. —

C. I will reconcile the city, for

1) I am responsible for his deed.

The symmetry of address may again be  
remarked.

In four of the dramas the god lingers  
a little after his first long admonition, and





has a few additional lines. In trying to find some general heading under which these phenomena might be grouped, I accepted the following section as a safe one. The words of the Mist machine subsequent to their principal speech serve but to enforce the commands already given. This may be shown in each case by a word, viz.:

Electra. The Dioscuri:  $\sigma\tau\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\chi'$  (v. 1343).

Thyemia Taurica. Athena:  $'(T'(\tilde{\omega}\pi\rho\alpha\iota')$  - v. 1486.

Ion. Athena:  $\tilde{\iota}\beta\omega$  (v. 1618).

Crestes. Apollo:  $\begin{cases} \chi\omega\rho\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\tau\epsilon & (v. 1678). \\ \tilde{\iota}\tau\epsilon & (v. 1682). \end{cases}$



Analogous unxavai.

The Medea,

The Rhesus,

The Philoctetes.



In this section it is proposed to treat briefly three specimens of unxarn which do not properly fall within the discussion of our principal subject. These are the Medea, the Rheus, and the Philoctetes.

### Medea.

Medea's chariot is not something independently possessed. She has not become a god, but is allowed immortal prerogatives as the daughter of 'Hdios. His timewait is a just recompense for her oft acknowledged dependence upon him (cf. Med. 446, 746, 764, 954, 11255 by 'The Chorus,) and finally 1321).

A close analysis of her final speeches will partly indicate the resemblances and differences between Medea ex machina and the Medea.

Medea speaks:





Command. — A. Address (no name), Introduction (eve)  
Command. — B. Cease your toil, and  
Reason. — C. I speak (if you wish), for  
1) You cannot touch me, since  
a) my father Helios has  
given me a protecting chariot.

[Remonstrance of Jason.]

Statement. — { D. I might answer at length, but  
(Past and Present) { not Zeus understand the case.  
E. It was not fated that you  
should reap the rewards of outrage,  
F. Nor that the princess and  
Creon should exile me.  
G. How as you will.  
[Stichomythia]

Statement (Future) — { H. I will bury my children in  
Hera's precinct, that  
1) No hostile hand may disturb them



Prophecy. —

1. Corinth shall receive a barren festival, to celebrate the present slaughter.

Statements (Facts) — J. I myself go to Athens.  
[Guthrie's copy]

With Medea's initial guess of sarcasm, cf. Iph. Taur. 1735 (Athens to Theos). Jason's overture, like that of Theos, is absolute. Although not deigning to utter the name of Jason, the seeress calls attention to herself by ἐγὼ τὴν εἰργασάμενν. Then comes the short, sharp order: παῦσαι πρὶον τοῦδ' (cf. Cr. 1625, Iph. Taur. 1737). Beyond this there is practically no command, except the informal one (v. 1374): στεῖχε πρὸς ἄνδρα καὶ ἄπ' ἄδελφον. Narrative gives out to be replaced by an exposition of cause and effects. Prophecy shrinks to an



announcement of personal intention (cf. *Lyssa* in *Herc. Fur.*), and perhaps in the founding of a festival for Corinth (v. 1381 ff.), another common procedure of the deus ex machina. There is no reference to the action of Fate; *Medea*, indeed, is herself that Fate: but the turn of expression in v. 1354 shows that from the first moment of Jason's ambition his downfall was a settled thing. — With *Medea*'s last words (v. 1404), cf. *Supp.* 1224:  $\kappa\omicron\upsilon\kappa\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu\ \alpha\lambda\lambda\omega\varsigma$ .

### Rhesus.

No general consideration has been accorded to the Rhesus in this paper, on the ground that it has not been proved to belong to Euripides. A study of the deus ex machina does not tend to confirm our belief in his authorship.

There are in the drama two other phrases





First, & then demands it not to be done and  
 remedies by positive counsel, and by leaving  
 Paris. This Proserpine may immediately be  
 left out of account as having no point of  
 contact with the *Empire des Dieux*. To express  
 the difference in terms of Homer, this goddess is  
 rather the Athena who circulates through the hell  
 during the Slughter of the Trojans than she who  
 drops from heaven to arrest the arm of Achilles  
 in his quarrel with a Trojan man. And she is  
 quite the Athena of Sophocles', *Orestes*.

In addition, the Muse appears at v. 890  
 to crown her son. These similarities would be in  
 order.

He begins with an address, - To the, - and  
 then declares her own identity. That of command  
 there is none. Instead, there is narrative, pass-  
 ing into a prophecy, and returning to narrative





The immediate, but not distant, future is foretold, and only as relates to Phrosus, — as an effect for which death shall be the reward of the opposing side, shall otherwise perish. The situation of rival goddesses (Phros vs. Athena) bears a slight resemblance to the Hippolytus. The scene is made at Pangaeum in Thrace, where Phrosus is said to have had an oracle, but no memorial custom is instituted, nor does the Phros leave any impress on the play. In the contrary, the finale is brought on by Hector (to whom the chorus turn, abandoning Phrosus to his mother), and the piece ends with a spirited exhortation to renew the attack.

The only great reason for the introduction of this divinity is that she may direct suspicion of the murder from Hector to the real source. That only, however, is this point not strongly brought out, but it is made known to a chorus.



not of Thucydides, but of Thojans, who are standing  
and then impeded to Hector by the royal  
character alone. There is no reference to  
Fate in any of the lines, and the entrance,  
being made at a time when matters have reached  
a standstill, has no result on the action. In  
general, this being is more reflective and less  
active than the regular Euripidean deus ex  
machina.

### Philoctetes.

Heracles in the Philoctetes meets pretty  
well most Euripidean tests. The entrance is  
made most unexpectedly, and not until every  
hope of inducing Philoctetes to sail to Troy has  
been fully given up. Thus the natural outcome  
is completely reversed. With all this, yet, the  
hero finds his discourse to the men's provisions



conversation, - a touch not found in Euripides.

The address  $\pi\alpha\iota\ \text{Μολαιος}$  is first made, followed by the self-announcement  $\alpha\iota\ \delta\iota\upsilon\ \tau\iota\upsilon\ \text{Ηρακλῆος}$ . Then the object of the interruption is stated. As if to afford an index of the different temperaments of the two tragedians, this here declares that it is "the counsel of Zeus" which he is about to unfold (not the "will of Fate", as in Euripides).

Next comes narrative, - a personal illustration (cf. *Teles* in the *Andromacha*): after that, the injunction to Philoctetes ( $\phi\iota\lambda\omicron\kappa\iota\delta\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ , v. 1721) to imitate his example: finally, a prophecy of the glory to be won at Troy. Then follow commands to dedicate proper spoils to the gods of Heracles. Neoptolemus is urged to be the hero's constant companion. The deliverance closes by insisting on justice toward





the gods, we being that separate which, if bowed,  
shall bring all the blessings in its train.

— There is none of the "Fate" issue here. A  
single  $\chi\rho\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  has tucked away in v. 1439, but  
it does not join in the orthodox dominion of  
the supreme Father.

The second utterance of Heracles (v. 1447-51),  
as happened in Euripides, proves to be but a  
repetition of his earlier behest.

The relation of the Trojan scene to the Euripidean deus ex machina is a difficult and  
disputed question. Some regard it as an imi-  
tation, due to the enormous success which  
probably attended at first the elaboration of the  
device: but if that be true, the imitation would  
seem to be, at all events, in the vein of Sophocles,  
and colored by his own artistic genius.



## Bibliography.

Euripides, various editions. Stauck's text adopted, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (Vols. I and II) and 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Vol. III)

Vicamowitz-Moellendorff U. v.: Euripides Hippolytos. Berlin, 1891.

Heracles. II vols. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Berlin, 1895.

Barthold, Th.: Ausgewählte Tragödien des Euripides. 7<sup>tes</sup> Bändchen. Hippolytus. Berlin, 1880.

Gophodes, Bindorf's text, 6<sup>th</sup> ed. (Meckler) adopted.

Lowe, H. B.: The Old Testament in Greek, according to the Septuagint. III vols. Cambridge, 1887-94.

Westcott and Hort: The New Testament in the Original Greek. Cambridge, 1871.

Wilson, R. H.: Select Specimens of the Theatre of the Hindus. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. II vols. London, 1871.



Bibliography - Continued.

Reinhardt, G. : Grundriss der griechischen Literatur. 3te Bearbeitung. 2<sup>ter</sup> Teil. 2te Abtheilung. Halle, 1872.

Müller, K. G. : Geschichte der griechischen Literatur. Von E. Müller herausgegeben. 4<sup>te</sup> Auflage, bearb. von E. Heitsy. Stuttgart, 1872.

Michaels, G. P. : A History of Classical Greek Literature. II vols. London, 1880.

Tander, L. : Geschichte der griechischen Literatur. Leipzig, 1886.

Cross, F. B. : A History of Greek Literature to the death of Demosthenes. New York, 1886.

Borch, J. : Griechische Literaturgeschichte. 4<sup>ter</sup> Band, von R. Peppmüller herausgegeben. Berlin, 1887.

Fittl, K. : Geschichte der griechischen Literatur. 3<sup>ter</sup> Teil. München, 1887.

Con, S. S. : A History of Greek Literature. New York, 1893.





*Bibliographie - Continued.*

Leist, W. : Geschichte der griechischen Literatur.  
3te Auflage. München, 1891.

Weil, F. : Études sur le drame antique. Paris,  
1847.

Patin, M. : Études sur les Tragiques Grecs. - Euripide. - II vols. Paris, 1873.

Turnell, H. W. : Euripides, the Rationalist. Cambridge, 1895.

Butcher, L. H. : Some Aspects of the Greek Genius.  
London, 1891.

Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine  
Art, London, 1895.

Campbell, L. : Religion in Greek Literature. London, 1895.

Levy, H. : Einiges über Tóxx. In Festschriften  
für klassische Philologie, 1892, pp. 761-7.

Meier, W. : Die Bacchen des Euripides. In Philo-  
logus, N. F., XII, pp. 362-400.

Meier, F. : Étude sur la Péronne Grecque Tyche.





Bibliography - Concluded.

Theris, Paris, 1887.

Tavelle, J. : Le Destin et la Mort dans la  
Tragédie Grecque. Progr. Luxembourg,  
1877.

Tusser, E. : Religionsanschauungen des  
Euripides. Vortrag. Hamburg, 1877.

Schreier, H. : Zur Würdigung des deus ex  
machina in griechischen Tragödie.  
In Rheinisches Museum, 1867 (pp.  
547-64) und 1868 (pp. 103-120).

Kühn, H. : De deo ex machina Euripidei.  
Progr. Glendal, 1875.



## Life.

I was born at Andover, Massachusetts, November  
twelfth, 1874. My early education comprised four years  
in a private, one in the Grammar, one in the High School.  
At Phillips Andover Academy I spent five years, begin-  
ning with the "second-year" Scientific work, and sub-  
sequently passing through the entire "Classical" course.  
I entered the Sophomore class of Harvard College in the  
fall of 1892, and was graduated from that institution in  
1895. While there I came under the instruction of Pro-  
fessors Goodwin, F. O. Allen, J. W. White, J. H. Wright, M.  
H. Morgan, Lannan, C. L. Smith, of Doctors Howard and  
Hayles, and of Messrs. Gulick and C. T. Parker. During  
1895-6 I was in the Graduate School, but pursued no  
classical studies save to the extent of informal and irregular  
attendance upon certain courses, and participation in  
the work of the Fowett Club.

The next year was passed in teaching French and  
German at the Brooklyn (N. Y.) Latin School. In the fall



of 1887 I came to Baltimore, where I have since resided  
as a member of the Graduate Department of Johns Hopkins  
University. Here I have attended the lectures of Professors  
Gildersleeve, Thompson, Warren, A. F. Smith, and Miller,  
and of Dr. H. L. Wilson. Since 1897 I have travelled  
in Europe (from Ireland to Greece), in the Western States,  
British Columbia, and Mexico. In 1898 I was ap-  
pointed University Scholar, and for 1899-1900 Fellow in  
Greek at the Johns Hopkins. To Professor Gildersleeve  
for inspiration and suggestion, to Professors Thompson  
and Miller for advice and encouragement I desire to  
express my sincere thanks and gratitude.





















